arXiv:math/0506280v2 [math.DS] 15 Dec 2006

STABILITY OF RELATIVE EQUILIBRIA WITH SINGULAR MOMENTUM VALUES IN SIMPLE MECHANICAL SYSTEMS

MIGUEL RODRÍGUEZ-OLMOS

Abstract. A method for testing stability of relative equilibria in Hamiltonian systems of the form "kinetic + potential energy" is presented. This method extends previously existing techniques to the case of non-free group actions and singular momentum values. A normal form for the symplectic matrix at a relative equilibrium is also obtained.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 37J25, 77H33, 53D20

1. Introduction

A relative equilibrium in a dynamical system with symmetry is a point in phase space for which its dynamical evolution is contained in a group orbit. The study of relative equilibria in symmetric Hamiltonian systems has been around for a long time, with its origins in the field of analytical dynamics and more recently using the modern symplectic and Poisson geometric setup. Relative equilibria are important since they are the analogues to equilibrium states in systems with symmetry, formalized with the action of a Lie group on the phase space. In physical applications, the only observable equilibrium states are those which are stable under small perturbations. Similarly, in the symmetric context, the only observable relative equilibria are those which are stable in some adequate sense. Based in Noether's Theorem, geometrized in the property of the invariance of the level sets of the momentum map, the notion of stability generally adopted is that of G_μ-*stability* introduced in [15], and that is closely related to the Lyapunov stability of the induced Hamiltonian flow on the reduced phase space.

In the field of analytical dynamics, the classical Routh Theorem gives conditions on the stability of steady motions which keep stationary the value of a first integral of a dynamical system for fixed values of the others (see for instance [18] and the treatments based on the Routh Theorem in [4, 14]). Relative equilibria are seen in this context as steady motions for systems having cyclic coordinates due to the existence of a symmetry group, for which the components of the momentum map together with the energy provide a set of first integrals. In the last decades, the implementation of these principles within the field of Geometric Mechanics has been studied. This has produced methods (like the Energy-Momentum Method [15] and the Energy-Casimir Method [1], see also [9] for an overview) to test the stability of relative equilibria in Hamiltonian systems for arbitrary symmetry groups and momentum values. These methods exploit Noether's Theorem and the symplectic and Poisson geometry of the phase space. In the case that the relative equilibrium under study lies in a regular value μ of the momentum map, the Energy-Momentum

corresponding email: miguel.rodriguez@epfl.ch, phone: +41 21 6935507, fax: +41 21 6935839.

Method of [15] provides a technique to test its stability modulo the action of G_μ, the stabilizer of the momentum value μ under the coadjoint representation of G. This was generalized in [5] and [11] to also cover the case when the momentum value is singular (this happens when the symmetry group does not act freely on phase space), assuming G_μ is compact. Also, in [10] and [16] stability of relative equilibria satisfying several other hypotheses is investigated.

A very important particular kind of Hamiltonian system is the class of *simple mechanical systems*, paradigmatic of Classical Mechanics, since many Hamiltonian system of physical interest lie in this category or can be obtained from a simple mechanical system by some suitable reduction process. These have as phase space the cotangent bundle of a Riemannian manifold (called configuration space) equipped with its canonical symplectic form, and the Hamiltonian function is of the type "kinetic plus potential" energy, where the kinetic energy is given by the norm obtained from the Riemannian metric, and the potential energy is the pullback of a function defined on the base. Symmetry in this systems is implemented by the lift of an isometric action on the base that preserves the potential energy. This big amount of extra structure with respect to general Hamiltonian systems on arbitrary symplectic or Poisson phase spaces implies that in simple mechanical systems everything is constructible from the knowledge of the configuration space, its Riemannian structure, the action of the symmetry group on it and the choice of an invariant potential energy. Therefore, it is reasonably to expect that the stability methods referred previously will particularize in a way that the involved computational complexity will simplify considerably, in that one would work at the level of the configuration space, instead of on its twice dimensional cotangent bundle.

In the case of regular relative equilibria, this refinement of the Energy-Momentum Method has been worked out in [19], and the obtained stability test for relative equilibria in simple mechanical systems is known as reduced Energy-Momentum Method. Its conditions for G_μ-stability are reduced from the level of phase space to the level of configuration space. This method has the highest degree of sophistication among the different stability tests available in the literature of symmetric Hamiltonian systems, and as part of it, it provides a block-diagonalization technique that allows to express the linearization of the Hamiltonian vector field at a relative equilibrium in a way adapted both to the symmetry of the system and to the fibered structure of the phase space. This block-diagonalization yields also further simplifications in the stability analysis.

Surprisingly, in the very frequent and important case of singular momentum values such a refinement for simple mechanical systems has not been studied in detail, and thus the application range of the reduced Energy-Momentum Method is severely limited. Indeed, the literature of applications of the theory of relative equilibria is full of examples in which singular relative equilibria of simple mechanical systems are studied with general geometric and Hamiltonian techniques which neglect their extra structure, in particular for the stability analysis. This paper provides a solution to this situation by obtaining a generalization to singular momentum values of the reduced Energy-Momentum Method and its main features.

In Section 2 we quickly review the theory of relative equilibria for general Hamiltonian systems and simple mechanical systems, and we collect some of the standard results on their stability by geometric methods. Section 3 is a necessary technical interlude on the properties and geometry of a distinguished symplectic component

of the linear slice for a cotangent-lifted action, and most of our subsequent results will rely on this section. In Section 4 our main result, Theorem 4.1, is stated, providing an extension of the reduced Energy-Momentum Method of [19] applicable to relative equilibria with singular momentum values. Section 5 applies this result to a classical example of a relative equilibrium with a singular momentum value in a well-known simple mechanical system consisting of an axisymmetric rigid body with a fixed point in an homogeneous gravity field. It is shown how the application of our method simplifies the stability analysis with respect to the application of the methods developed for general Hamiltonian systems. In Section 6 we extend the block-diagonalization result of [19] to the singular case, in Corollary 6.2 and Proposition 6.2. Finally, Section 7 puts in context our results with related work in the literature. In particular it is shown how the block-diagonal expression for the symplectic matrix of Proposition 6.2 particularizes in the regular case to the normal form obtained in [19], and a comparison is also made between our results and the Lagrangian Block-Diagonalization method of Lewis [6].

2. Relative Equilibria and simple mechanical systems

Let $(\mathcal{P},\omega)$ be a smooth finite dimensional symplectic manifold with symplectic form ω and G a finite dimensional Lie group acting smoothly, properly and in a Hamiltonian fashion on $(\mathcal{P},\omega)$ with Ad^*-equivariant momentum map $\mathbf{J}:\mathcal{P}\to\mathfrak{g}^*$. Given a G-invariant Hamiltonian function $h\in C^G(\mathcal{P})$, a point $z\in\mathcal{P}$ is called a *relative equilibrium* (for h) if its Hamiltonian evolution lies inside a group orbit. Equivariance of $\mathbf{J}$ and Noether's Theorem imply that the Hamiltonian evolution of z is described as the orbit of z by a one-parameter subgroup of G generated by a Lie algebra element ξ which belongs to $\mathfrak{g}_\mu\subset\mathfrak{g}$, where $\mu=\mathbf{J}(z)$ and $\mathfrak{g}_\mu$ is the Lie algebra of G_μ, the stabilizer of μ for the coadjoint representation of G. The element ξ is called a *velocity* of the relative equilibrium. Using the usual notation for the infinitesimal action of $\mathfrak{g}$ on $\mathcal{P}$ the condition for z to be a relative equilibrium is written as $X_h(z)=\xi_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$, where X_h is the Hamiltonian vector field associated to the function h.

If the stabilizer G_z of z is not discrete then there is a degeneracy in the choice of a velocity for a given relative equilibrium, since any representative of the class $[\xi]\in\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}_z$ produces the same orbit of z. In any case, by equivariance of $\mathbf{J}$, the inclusion $G_z\subset G_\mu$ holds. The quintuple $(\mathcal{P},\omega,G,\mathbf{J},h)$ will be called in short a symmetric Hamiltonian system.

The following definition introduced in [15] is generally adopted as the correct notion of stability of relative equilibria in Hamiltonian systems, generalizing in the Hamiltonian context the concept of Lyapunov stability of fixed equilibria for flows of vector fields.

Definition 2.1. *A relative equilibrium z with momentum $\mu=\mathbf{J}(z)$ is said to be G_μ-stable if for every G_μ-invariant neighbourhood U of $G_\mu\cdot z$ there exists a neighbourhood O of z such that the Hamiltonian orbit of O lies in U.*

In [5, 11] a method for testing stability of relative equilibria with singular momentum values in Hamiltonian systems is developed, generalizing the Energy-Momentum Method of [15] for relative equilibria with discrete stabilizers. We quote here the main result, due to its importance in the subsequent development of the paper. For that, given an element $\xi\in\mathfrak{g}$, define the *augmented Hamiltonian*

$h_\xi \in C^\infty(\mathcal{P})$ as

$$h_\xi(z) = h(z) - \langle \mathbf{J}(z), \xi \rangle. \tag{2.1}$$

It well-known that $z \in \mathcal{P}$ is a relative equilibrium for the symmetric Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{P}, \omega, G, \mathbf{J}, h)$ with velocity ξ if and only if z is a critical point of h_ξ. Also recall that since the Hamiltonian G-action is proper, any stabilizer for this action, in particular G_z, must be compact (see [2]). Since $\mathfrak{g}_z \subset \mathfrak{g}_\mu$ we can choose a G_z-equivariant splitting of $\mathfrak{g}_\mu$ as $\mathfrak{g}_\mu = \mathfrak{g}_z \oplus \mathfrak{g}_z^\perp$.

Theorem 2.1 ([5],[11])**.** *Let $(\mathcal{P}, \omega, G, \mathbf{J}, h)$ be a symmetric Hamiltonian system and $z \in \mathcal{P}$ a relative equilibrium with stabilizer G_z and velocity ξ. Assume that $\mathbf{J}(z) = \mu$ and that G_μ is compact. Then $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_\mu$. Let $\xi^\perp$ be the projection of ξ onto some G_z-invariant complement of $\mathfrak{g}_z$ in $\mathfrak{g}_\mu$ (always available by compactness of G_z). If $\mathbf{d}_z^2 h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$ is definite for some (and hence any) complement V_s to $\mathfrak{g}_\mu \cdot z$ in $\ker T_z\mathbf{J}$, then z is G_μ-stable.*

In this theorem the ambiguity in the velocity introduced by the stabilizer of the relative equilibrium appears explicitly. In typical computations, testing this condition over all possible G_z-invariant complements of $\mathfrak{g}_z$ in $\mathfrak{g}_\mu$ gives the sharpest stability results (see [11] and the example in Section 5). There is an infinite number of choices for the space V_s in Theorem 2.1, and any of them is called the (maximal) *symplectic normal space* at z, since it is a maximal symplectic subspace of the symplectic orthogonal to the group orbit at z.

In this paper we will study a particular case of Hamiltonian systems of great interest in Classical Mechanics. This is the class of the so-called symmetric *simple mechanical systems*, which are symmetric Hamiltonian systems where $\mathcal{P}$ is T^*Q, the cotangent bundle of a smooth, finite-dimensional Riemannian manifold $(Q, \ll \cdot, \cdot \gg)$ equipped with its canonical symplectic form ω and G is a finite-dimensional Lie group acting properly and isometrically on Q and by cotangent lifts on T^*Q.

Following [20], the Hamiltonian function is constructed in the following way: let V be a smooth G-invariant function on Q and call $\overline{V} = \tau^* V \in C^G(T^*Q)$, where $\tau : T^*Q \to Q$ is the cotangent bundle projection. We will refer to both $\overline{V}$ and V as the *potential energy*. Let $\mathbb{F}\mathrm{L} : TQ \to T^*Q$ be the *Legendre map* associated to $\ll \cdot, \cdot \gg$, defined by the formula

$$\langle \mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}(v_x), w_x \rangle = \ll v_x, w_x \gg, \quad \forall\, v_x, w_x \in T_xQ. \tag{2.2}$$

The Legendre map is a G-equivariant vector bundle isomorphism covering the identity on Q. With it, we can define the *kinetic energy* $K \in C^G(\mathcal{P})$ as

$$K(p_x) = \frac{1}{2} \ll \mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}^{-1}(p_x), \mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}^{-1}(p_x) \gg, \quad \forall\, p_x \in T_x^*Q.$$

Finally, the Hamiltonian h is defined by

$$h = K + \overline{V}. \tag{2.3}$$

With respect to the canonical symplectic structure of T^*Q the cotangent-lifted action of G is Hamiltonian, with equivariant momentum map defined by the expression

$$\langle \mathbf{J}(p_x), \xi \rangle = \langle p_x, \xi_Q(x) \rangle, \quad \forall\, \xi \in \mathfrak{g}. \tag{2.4}$$

The symplectic manifold T^*Q is the phase space of the Hamiltonian system, while the base Q is usually called *configuration space*. Accordingly, for any point p_x in

T^*Q, the projection $x = \tau(p_x)$ is called the configuration point (or base point) of p_x.

A key feature of simple mechanical systems is that both their geometric and dynamical properties are entirely constructed using the knowledge of the Riemannian manifold $(Q, \ll \cdot, \cdot \gg)$, the isometric G-action on it and the choice of a potential energy V. Thus, one could reasonably expect that the implementation on this class of Hamiltonian systems of the stability test given in Theorem 2.1 should simplify accordingly, and yield easier computations at the level of Q and G instead of the bigger space $\mathcal{P} = T^*Q$. The obtention of such a refinement to simple mechanical systems of this stability test is the main result of this paper, Theorem 4.1.

Remark 2.1. There are several treatments of this problem in the literature. Simo *et al.* develop in [19] a sophisticated test, that particularizes Theorem 2.1, called the reduced Energy-Momentum Method. This test gives sufficient conditions for the stability of relative equilibria in simple mechanical systems provided the configuration point of the cotangent relative equilibrium has a discrete stabilizer (which is the same as to require that its momentum value is regular). The main advantage of this is that it is constructed specifically for this class of systems, and this fact reflects in less computational difficulties than the application of the main method, Theorem 2.1, designed for general Hamiltonian systems. In [6] a Lagrangian analogue of the results of [19] is obtained, being valid also for relative equilibria of a larger class of mechanical systems. Here, based in Theorem 2.1, we produce a method for testing stability of relative equilibria in simple mechanical systems that could be seen as a generalization of the reduced Energy-Momentum Method to the singular case, i.e. without requiring discrete stabilizers of configuration points or regular momentum values.

3. A cotangent-bundle adapted splitting of the symplectic normal space

In this section we describe a realization $V_s \subset T_{p_x}(T^*Q)$ of the symplectic normal space at a relative equilibrium p_x of a simple mechanical system, as well as a convenient cotangent-bundle adapted splitting of V_s which will be extremely useful for the remaining constructions. Most of the results of this section are merely expository, and a complete description including proofs and the obtention of the symplectic normal space at points p_x of general form, not only relative equilibria, can be found in [17].

One of the geometric objects that will be extensively used is the *locked inertia tensor* $\mathbb{I}$, a family of bilinear positive semi-definite symmetric forms on $\mathfrak{g}$ defined by

$$\mathbb{I}(x)(\xi, \eta) = \ll \xi_Q(x), \eta_Q(x) \gg, \quad \forall\, \xi, \eta \in \mathfrak{g},\, x \in Q. \tag{3.1}$$

Note that at each point x, the kernel of $\mathbb{I}(x)$ is precisely $\mathfrak{g}_x$, the Lie algebra of the stabilizer of x. Therefore $\mathbb{I}(x)$ is a well defined inner product on $\mathfrak{g}$ only at points of Q where the action is locally free. The locked inertia tensor satisfies the following invariance and infinitesimal invariance properties (see [9]):

$$\mathbb{I}(g \cdot x)(\mathrm{Ad}_g \xi, \mathrm{Ad}_g \eta) = \mathbb{I}(x)(\xi, \eta) \tag{3.2}$$

$$(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot \lambda_Q(x))(\xi, \eta) + \mathbb{I}(x)(\mathrm{ad}_\lambda \xi, \eta) + \mathbb{I}(x)(\xi, \mathrm{ad}_\lambda \eta) = 0, \tag{3.3}$$

for every $g \in G$, $x \in Q$ and $\xi, \eta, \lambda \in \mathfrak{g}$. Note that $G_{p_x} \subset G_x$ by the equivariance of τ. Let $x \in Q$ be the base point of an element $p_x \in T^*Q$ and denote by $H = G_x$ its stabilizer. Using the G-invariant Riemannian metric on Q we can form the splitting

$$T_xQ = \mathfrak{g} \cdot x \oplus \mathbf{S} \tag{3.4}$$

where $\mathbf{S} = (\mathfrak{g} \cdot x)^{\perp}$, and it is usually called a linear slice (for the G-action at x). Hence, $\mathbf{S}$ is the space of directions orthogonally complementary to the group orbit. This is obviously a H-invariant splitting for the induced linear H-action on T_xQ.

Next we choose a G_{p_x}-invariant splitting of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of the form

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{r}. \tag{3.5}$$

This is always possible by the properness of the G-action on Q, which implies that G_{p_x} is compact. A concrete way of choosing (3.5) will be introduced in (3.14). For any element $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$ we write in a unique way $\xi = \xi^{\mathfrak{h}} + \xi^{\mathfrak{r}}$, relative to this splitting. The space $\mathfrak{r}$ collects the elements of $\mathfrak{g}$ that generate nontrivial orbits of x.

Noting that $\mathfrak{r} \simeq \mathfrak{g} \cdot x$ by the isomorphism $\xi \mapsto \xi_Q(x)$, we can compose this identification with (3.4) and dualize, to get

$$T_xQ \simeq \mathfrak{r} \oplus \mathbf{S} \quad \text{and} \quad T_x^*Q \simeq \mathfrak{r}^* \oplus \mathbf{S}^*. \tag{3.6}$$

Associated to the Riemannian structure on Q, there is an Ehresmann connection on T^*Q, for which the connection map at p_x, $K : T_{p_x}(T^*Q) \to T_x^*Q$ is defined as

$$K(X) = \frac{D_c^{\nabla}}{Dt}\Big|_{t=0} \hat{c}(t) \quad \forall X \in T_{p_x}(T^*Q), \tag{3.7}$$

the covariant differential of $\hat{c}(t)$ along $c(t) = \tau(c(t))$ relative to the Levi-Civita connection ∇. Here $\hat{c}(t)$ is any local curve $\hat{c} : (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \to T^*Q$ projecting to $c(t)$ and satisfying $i)\, \hat{c}(0) = p_x$, and $ii)\, \frac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0} \hat{c}(t) = X$. This connection map K at p_x is a G_{p_x}-equivariant linear map, which combined with the differential at p_x of the cotangent bundle projection τ yields a G_{p_x}-equivariant linear isomorphism $\Psi : T_{p_x}(T^*Q) \to T_xQ \oplus T_x^*Q = T^*(T_xQ)$ defined by

$$\Psi(X) = (T_{p_x}\tau(X), K(X)) \quad \forall\, X \in T_{p_x}(T^*Q)$$

(see [17]). We call vectors at p_x lying in the kernel of $T_{p_x}\tau$ *vertical*, since they are tangent to the cotangent fiber through p_x. Analogously, those elements of $T_{p_x}(T^*Q)$ which are in the kernel of K are called *horizontal*, and are identified through $T_{p_x}\tau$ with vectors tangent to Q at x. We now compose the above isomorphism Ψ with the two dual isomorphisms (3.6) to get a new one

$$I : T_{p_x}(T^*Q) \to (\mathfrak{r} \oplus \mathbf{S}) \oplus (\mathfrak{r}^* \oplus \mathbf{S}^*) \tag{3.8}$$

which can be explicitly expressed as $I(X) = (\eta, a; \nu, \alpha)$, for the unique η, a, ν, α satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} T_{p_x}\tau(X) &= a + \eta_Q(x) \\ K(X) &= \alpha + \mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}\left(\left(\hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}(\nu)\right)_Q(x)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Here $\hat{\mathbb{I}}_0$ denotes the restriction of $\mathbb{I}$ to $\mathfrak{r}$, according to (3.5). Note that now $\hat{\mathbb{I}}_0$ becomes a well-defined inner product in $\mathfrak{r}$ and thus also a linear isomorphism $\hat{\mathbb{I}}_0 : \mathfrak{r} \to \mathfrak{r}^* \simeq \mathfrak{h}^\circ$. We can therefore work in the image of I, which we call I-representation, instead of on $T_{p_x}(T^*Q)$, and that is what we will do in the rest of the paper. Note

that in this identification the space of vertical and horizontal vectors is expressed, respectively, as

$$(0,0;\nu,\alpha) \quad \forall\, \alpha \in \mathbf{S}^*,\, \nu \in \mathfrak{r}^*, \quad \text{and} \quad (\eta,a;0,0) \quad \forall\, a \in \mathbf{S},\, \eta \in \mathfrak{r}.$$

The isomorphism I is G_{p_x}-equivariant with respect to the linear action on the target space given by

$$g \cdot (\eta, a; \nu, \alpha) = (\mathrm{Ad}_g \eta, g \cdot a, \mathrm{Ad}^*_{g^{-1}} \nu, g \cdot \alpha), \tag{3.9}$$

where $g \cdot a$ and $g \cdot \alpha$ denote, respectively, the restriction to G_{p_x} of the linear representation of H on $\mathbf{S}$ and its contragredient representation on $\mathbf{S}^*$. This action is well defined since $G_{p_x} \subset H$ and $\mathbf{S}$, $\mathfrak{r}$, and their duals are H-invariant by construction.

In order to obtain a convenient characterization of the symplectic normal space $V_s \subset T_{p_x}(T^*Q)$ at a relative equilibrium in the I-representation, and also for future reference, we quote some technical results introduced in [17]. There it is proved that it is possible to extend vectors $v \in \mathbf{S}$ to local vector fields $\overline{v}$ defined in a neighbourhood of x, in a way adapted to the G-action, and such that the family of vector fields $\lambda_Q, \overline{v}$, for any $\lambda \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $v \in \mathbf{S}$ spans $T_{x'}Q$ at every x' near x.

We will sketch here the obtention of the local field $\overline{v}$. Recall that by Palais' Tube Theorem [12] we can construct an invariant tubular neighbourhood of an orbit $G \cdot x \subset Q$ as follows: Let $H = G_x$ act on $G \times \mathbf{S}$ as $h \cdot (g,s) = (gh^{-1}, h \cdot s)$. Let $G \times_H \mathbf{S}$ be the quotient space for this action. Then there is a H-invariant open ball $U \subset \mathbf{S}$ centered at the origin such that the map $\sigma : G \times_H U \to Q$ defined by

$$\sigma([g,s]) = g \cdot \exp_x s \tag{3.10}$$

is a diffeomorphism onto a G-invariant neighbourhood O of $G \cdot x$. Here $\exp_x : T_xQ \to Q$ denotes the exponential map associated to $\ll \cdot, \cdot \gg$. This diffeomorphism is G-equivariant with respect to the given action on Q and the G-action on $G \times_H \mathbf{S}$ defined by $g' \cdot [g,s] = [g'g, s]$.

Now choose any inner product on $\mathfrak{g}$ such that the splitting (3.5) is an orthogonal direct sum. Extend this inner product by right translations to a H-invariant Riemannian metric on G. Then we can interpret $\mathfrak{r}$ as a linear slice at the identity for the free H-action on G given by $(h,g) \mapsto gh^{-1}$. It follows that if we call $\exp_e$ the exponential map for this metric on G, there is a small H-invariant neighbourhood of e in G such that every g belonging to it can be written as $g = \exp_e \xi^{\mathfrak{r}} h^{-1}$ for unique elements $\xi^{\mathfrak{r}} \in \mathfrak{r}$ and $h \in H$. Using the Tube Theorem every element in a small neighbourhood of x in Q (not G-invariant in general) can be expressed as $x' = \sigma([\exp_e \xi^{\mathfrak{r}} h^{-1}, s])$ for unique elements $\xi^{\mathfrak{r}} \in \mathfrak{r}$, $h \in H$ and $s \in U$. It is easy to prove that for any $x' = \sigma([\exp_e \xi^{\mathfrak{r}} h^{-1}, s])$ near x, the formula

$$F_v^t(x') = \sigma([\exp_e \xi^{\mathfrak{r}} h^{-1}, s + th \cdot v])$$

defines a flow F_v^t for any $v \in U \subset \mathbf{S}$. The associated local field $\overline{v}$ is then defined as

$$\overline{v}(x') = \left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t\,=\,0} F_v^t(x') \tag{3.11}$$

for every x' near x. In the following theorem we collect the most important properties of this family of local vector fields. For the proof, see [17].

Theorem 3.1. *Let $v, w \in \mathbf{S}$ and $\eta, \lambda, \xi, \xi_i, \xi_j \in \mathfrak{g}$. Then*

(i) $\ll \nabla_{\xi_{iQ}} \xi_{jQ}(x), \lambda_Q(x) \gg = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \left(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot \xi^{\mathfrak{r}}_{iQ}(x) \right) (\xi_j, \lambda) - \mathbb{I}(x)(\xi_i^{\mathfrak{r}}, [\xi_j, \lambda]) \right\}$

(ii) $\ll \nabla_{\xi_{iQ}} \xi_{jQ}(x), w \gg = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot w \right) (\xi_i^{\mathfrak{r}},\, \xi_j)$

(iii) $\ll \nabla_{\xi_Q}\,\overline{v}(x), \lambda_Q(x) \gg = \frac{1}{2}\,(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot v)\,(\xi^{\mathfrak{r}},\,\lambda)$
(iv) $\ll \nabla_{\overline{v}}\,\xi_Q(x), \lambda_Q(x) \gg = \frac{1}{2}\,(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot v)\,(\xi,\lambda)$
(v) $\ll \nabla_{\overline{v}}\,\xi_Q(x), w \gg = \ll \nabla_{\xi_Q}\,\overline{v}(x), w \gg + \ll \xi^{\mathfrak{h}}\cdot v, w \gg$.

Here, $\xi^{\mathfrak{r}}, \xi_i^{\mathfrak{r}}$ and $\xi^{\mathfrak{h}}$ denote the projections of elements of $\mathfrak{g}$ onto $\mathfrak{r}$ and $\mathfrak{h}$ according to (3.5).

Notation: We will introduce for any $v \in \mathbf{S}$ a linear map $C(v) : \mathfrak{r} \to \mathbf{S}^*$ defined as

$$\ll C(v)(\xi^{\mathfrak{r}}), w \gg_{\mathbf{S}} = \ll \nabla_{\xi_Q}\,\overline{v}(x), w \gg, \tag{3.12}$$

where $\ll \cdot,\cdot \gg_{\mathbf{S}}$ is the restriction of the metric on Q to $\mathbf{S} \subset T_xQ$. Note that C is not linear in v since it depends on the concrete extension $\overline{v}$. We will also employ the following notation: if W is a linear subspace of the linear space V and $\iota : W \hookrightarrow V$ its inclusion, we will write $\mathbb{P}_W : V^* \to W^*$ for its dual projection.

We fix from now on a point of the form $p_x = \mathbb{FL}(\xi_Q(x))$ with $G_x = H$. It follows from (2.4) and the definition of the locked inertia tensor that p_x has momentum $\mu = \mathbf{J}(p_x) = \mathbb{I}(x)(\xi) = \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0(\xi^{\mathfrak{r}})$. The reason for this choice of p_x will be clear in the following section, where it is explained why every relative equilibrium of a simple mechanical system must be precisely of this form.

Remark. It is a well-known property of points of the form $p_x = \mathbb{FL}(\xi_Q(x))$ that $G_{p_x} = H \cap G_\mu$. This follows immediately from the relation $G_{p_x} = H_{p_x}$ and identifying $p_x = (0,\mu) \in \mathbf{S}^* \oplus \mathfrak{r}^*$ using the H-isomorphism (3.6). For general points of T^*Q one has only an inclusion $G_{p_x} \subset H \cap G_\mu$.

We now make a concrete choice for the complement $\mathfrak{r}$ in (3.5), as well as for other relevant subspaces of $\mathfrak{g}$. Start by choosing a G_{p_x}-invariant complement $\mathfrak{p}$ to $\mathfrak{g}_{p_x}$ in $\mathfrak{g}_\mu$, i.e.

$$\mathfrak{g}_\mu = \mathfrak{g}_{p_x} \oplus \mathfrak{p}. \tag{3.13}$$

Next, define a G_{p_x}-invariant complement $\mathfrak{t}$ to $\mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$ in $\mathfrak{g}$ in such a way that defining $\mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{p} \oplus \mathfrak{t}$ we have that $\mathfrak{p}$ and $\mathfrak{t}$ are orthogonal with respect to the restricted locked inertia tensor $\hat{\mathbb{I}}_0$. We can then write

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{p} \oplus \mathfrak{t}, \tag{3.14}$$

and hence we have constructed the splitting (3.5).

Let us define the following subspace of $\mathfrak{g}$

$$\mathfrak{q}^\mu = \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{t} \,:\, \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{h}}\,[\mathrm{ad}^*_\lambda \mu] = 0\}. \tag{3.15}$$

This space will play an important role in our characterization of V_s, and it can be proved (see [17]) that it is isomorphic to the symplectic normal space at μ for the restriction to H of the coadjoint action of G on $\mathcal{O}_\mu$, the coadjoint orbit containing μ. Note also that by using (3.3) we can write $\mathfrak{q}^\mu = \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{t} \,:\, \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{h}}\,[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\lambda_Q(x))(\xi^{\mathfrak{r}}) = 0]\}$.

As a particular case of Theorem 6.1 in [17] the space $\ker T_{p_x}\mathbf{J}$ consists in the I-representation in the elements $(\eta, a; \nu, \alpha) \in (\mathfrak{r} \oplus \mathbf{S}) \oplus (\mathfrak{r}^* \oplus \mathbf{S}^*)$ satisfying

$$\langle \nu, \lambda^{\mathfrak{r}} \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\left\{(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\xi_Q(x))\,(\lambda^{\mathfrak{r}},\eta) - (\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot a)\,(\lambda^{\mathfrak{r}},\xi) - \langle \mathrm{ad}^*_{\lambda^{\mathfrak{r}}}\mu, \eta\rangle\right\} + \langle \mathrm{ad}^*_{\lambda^{\mathfrak{h}}}\mu, \eta\rangle = 0$$

for every $\lambda^{\mathfrak{r}} \in \mathfrak{r}$ and $\lambda^{\mathfrak{h}} \in \mathfrak{h}$. Also, in the I-representation

$$\mathfrak{g}_\mu \cdot p_x = \left\{ \left(\lambda, 0; \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\xi_Q(x))(\lambda)\right], -\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{S}}\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot(\cdot))(\lambda,\xi)\right] \right) \,:\, \forall\, \lambda \in \mathfrak{p} \right\}.$$

From the above two expressions it is easy to obtain that the symplectic normal space V_s, a complement to $\mathfrak{g}_\mu \cdot p_x$ in $\ker T_{p_x}\mathbf{J}$, can be chosen to be

(3.16)
$$\begin{aligned} V_s &= \left\{ \left(\lambda, a; \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}} \left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot \xi_Q^{\mathfrak{r}}(x))(\lambda) + \mathrm{ad}^*_\lambda \mu - (\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot a)(\xi^{\mathfrak{r}})\right], \gamma \right.\right. \\ &- \left.\left. \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{S}} \left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot(\cdot))(\xi^{\mathfrak{r}},\lambda)\right] + \ll C(a)(\xi^{\mathfrak{r}}), \cdot \gg_{\mathbf{S}} \right) \,:\, \forall\, \lambda \in \mathfrak{q}^\mu,\, a \in \mathbf{S},\, \gamma \in \mathbf{S}^* \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with $\mathfrak{q}^\mu$ defined in (3.15) and $\mathbf{S}$ in (3.4). The symplectic normal space V_s is G_{p_x}-invariant by construction with respect to the action (3.9) in its ambient space (see [17]).

4. Stability of singular relative equilibria in simple mechanical systems

In the following we will be in the setup of Section 2 and fix a simple mechanical system $h = K + \overline{V}$ as in (2.3). In this framework, once an element $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$ is chosen, we can separate the augmented Hamiltonian (2.1) into a kinetic and a potential part as

$$h_\xi = K_\xi + \overline{V_\xi}, \quad \text{where}$$

$$K_\xi(p_x) = \frac{1}{2}\|p_x - \chi^\xi(x)\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad V_\xi(x) = V(x) - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I}(x)(\xi,\xi).$$

As for the potential energy we have used the notation $\overline{V_\xi} = \tau^* V_\xi$. The one-form χ^ξ is defined by

$$\chi^\xi(x) = \mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}(\xi_Q(x)). \tag{4.1}$$

The functions K_ξ and V_ξ are called the *augmented kinetic energy* and *augmented potential energy* respectively. Recall now (see for instance Theorem 4.1.2 and Proposition 4.2.1 in [9]) that with the introduction of these two auxiliary functions we have the following characterization of relative equilibria:

Proposition 4.1. *Let $p_x \in T^*Q$. The following are equivalent:*

(i) *p_x is a relative equilibrium of (2.3) with momentum μ and velocity $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_\mu$*
(ii) *p_x is a critical point of the augmented Hamiltonian h_ξ*
(iii) *p_x is simultaneously a critical point of K_ξ and $\overline{V_\xi}$*
(iv) *$p_x = \mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}(\xi_Q(x))$ and x is a critical point of V_ξ.*

Note that (iv) restricts the form of phase space points candidates to be relative equilibria of (2.3) to be of the form $p_x = \mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}(\xi_Q(x))$. Thus is the reason for studying in detail in the previous section the symplectic normal space only at this class of points.

Let $p_x = \mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}(\xi_Q(x)) \in T^*_xQ$ be a relative equilibrium for the simple mechanical system (2.3) with momentum $\mathbf{J}(p_x) = \mu$. We call $H = G_x$ and we choose a $(G_{p_x} = H \cap G_\mu)$-invariant inner product on $\mathfrak{g}$ relative to which we construct the splittings (3.13) and (3.14). Note that by hypothesis x is a critical point of $V_{\xi'}$ for any $\xi' \in \mathfrak{g}_\mu$ such that $[\xi' - \xi] = 0 \in \mathfrak{g}_\mu/\mathfrak{g}_{p_x}$. In other words, any such ξ' is a velocity for the relative equilibrium p_x. In particular, this happens for $\xi^\perp \in \mathfrak{p}$, the projection of ξ onto $\mathfrak{p}$ according to (3.13).

Let $\delta p \in T_{p_x}(T^*Q)$ be a tangent vector at p_x. We will write its horizontal and vertical components as $\delta p^H = T_{p_x}\tau(\delta p) \in T_xQ$ and $\delta p^V = K(\delta p) \in T^*_xQ$

respectively. It is clear that if $I(\delta p) = (\lambda, b; \nu, \gamma)$ is the I-representation of δp one has that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta p^H &= \lambda_Q(x) + b \\ \delta p^V &= \mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}\left((\hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}(\nu))_Q(x)\right) + \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Also, using (3.6) we can express the horizontal and vertical variations δp^H and δp^V as elements of $\mathfrak{r} \oplus \mathbf{S}$ and $\mathfrak{r}^* \oplus \mathbf{S}^*$ respectively like

$$\begin{aligned} \delta p^H &= (\lambda, b) \\ \delta p^V &= (\nu, \gamma). \end{aligned}$$

We will use both notations indistinctly.

Finally, for a curve $c(t) \in Q$ with $c(0) = x$ we will write $\mathrm{Hor}_{p_x}(c(t))$ for its horizontal lift to T^*Q at the point p_x with respect to the Levi-Civita connection. Equivalently, $\mathrm{Hor}_{p_x}(c(t))$ is the parallel translation of p_x along the curve $c(t)$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $p_x = \mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}(\xi_Q(x)) \in T_x^*Q$ be a relative equilibrium for the simple mechanical system (2.3) with momentum μ and velocity $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_\mu$. Let $\xi^\perp$ the orthogonal projection of ξ onto $\mathfrak{p}$ according to (3.13). Then, for any $\delta p_1, \delta p_2 \in T_{p_x}(T^*Q)$*

(i) $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} \overline{V_{\xi^\perp}}(\delta p_1, \delta p_2) = \mathbf{d}^2_x V_{\xi^\perp}(\delta p_1^H, \delta p_2^H)$

(ii) $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} K_{\xi^\perp}(\delta p_1, \delta p_2) = \ll \delta p_1^V - (T_x\chi^{\xi^\perp} \cdot \delta p_1^H)^V, \delta p_2^V - (T_x\chi^{\xi^\perp} \cdot \delta p_2^H)^V \gg.$

Proof. (i) follows immediately by the definition of δp^H and noting that $\overline{V_{\xi^\perp}} = \tau^* V_{\xi^\perp}$. To prove (ii) we will consider horizontal and vertical vectors separately. Let $I(\delta p_i) = (0; \delta p_i^V)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} K_{\xi^\perp}(\delta p_1, \delta p_2) &= \tfrac{1}{2}\tfrac{d}{ds}\big|_{s=0} \tfrac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0} \parallel p_x + t\delta p_1^V + s\delta p_2^V - \chi^{\xi^\perp}(x) \parallel^2 \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}\tfrac{d}{ds}\big|_{s=0} \tfrac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0} \parallel t\delta p_1^V + s\delta p_2^V(x) \parallel^2 \\ &= \ll \delta p_1^V, \delta p_2^V \gg. \end{aligned}$$

If $I(\delta p_1) = (0; \delta p_1^V)$ and $I(\delta p_2) = (\delta p_2^H; 0)$, let $c^t_{\delta p_2^H}(x)$ be any smooth curve satisfying $c^0_{\delta p_2^H}(x) = x$ and $\frac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0} c^t_{\delta p_2^H}(x) = \delta p_2^H$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} K_{\xi^\perp}(\delta p_1, \delta p_2) &= \tfrac{1}{2}\tfrac{d}{ds}\big|_{s=0} \tfrac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0} \parallel \mathrm{Hor}_{p_x + t\delta p_1^V}(c^s_{\delta p_2^H}(x)) - \chi^{\xi^\perp}(c^s_{\delta p_2^H}(x)) \parallel^2 \\ &= -\tfrac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0} \ll \nabla_{\delta p_2^H} \chi^{\xi^\perp}(x), p_x + t\delta p_1^V - \chi^{\xi^\perp}(x) \gg. \end{aligned}$$

But since p_x is a relative equilibrium with velocity ξ, then $p_x = \chi^{\xi^\perp}(x)$ and then

$$\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} K_{\xi^\perp}(\delta p_1, \delta p_2) = - \ll \nabla_{\delta p_2^H} \chi^{\xi^\perp}(x), \delta p_1^V \gg.$$

Finally, consider two variations of the form $I(\delta p_1) = (\delta p_1^H; 0)$ and $I(\delta p_2) = (\delta p_2^H; 0)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} K_{\xi^\perp}(\delta p_1, \delta p_2) = \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}\tfrac{d}{ds}\big|_{s=0} \tfrac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0} \parallel \mathrm{Hor}_{\mathrm{Hor}_{p_x}(c^t_{\delta p_1^H}(x))}(F^s_{\widetilde{\delta p_2^H}}(c^t_{\delta p_1^H}(x))) - \chi^{\xi^\perp}(F^s_{\widetilde{\delta p_2^H}}(c^t_{\delta p_1^H}(x))) \parallel^2 \\ &= -\tfrac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0} \ll \nabla_{\widetilde{\delta p_2^H}} \chi^{\xi^\perp}(c^t_{\delta p_1^H}(x)), \mathrm{Hor}_{p_x}(c^t_{\delta p_1^H}(x)) - \chi^{\xi^\perp}(c^t_{\delta p_1^H}(x)) \gg \\ &= \ll \nabla_{\delta p_2^H} \chi^{\xi^\perp}(x), \nabla_{\delta p_1^H} \chi^{\xi^\perp}(x) \gg. \end{aligned}$$

Where if $\delta p_2 = (\lambda, b)$, then $\widetilde{\delta p_2^H}$ is the local vector field $\overline{b} + \lambda_Q$, and $F^s_{\widetilde{\delta p_2^H}}$ denotes its flow. Recalling now the definition (3.7) of the operator K, for any $v \in T_xQ$ and

local extension $\widetilde{v}$ one has

$$\nabla_v \chi^{\xi^\perp}(x) = \nabla_{\widetilde{v}} \chi^{\xi^\perp}(x) = K(T_x\chi^{\xi^\perp} \cdot v) = (T_x\chi^{\xi^\perp} \cdot v)^V,$$

and the result is proved. □

Since every horizontal variation δp^H can be written as the sum of two contributions one coming from $\mathfrak{r}$ and the other from $\mathbf{S}$, that is $\delta p^H = \zeta_Q(x) + b$, for $\zeta \in \mathfrak{r}$, $b \in \mathbf{S}$, we can consider these two contributions separately and thus obtain concrete expressions for $(T_x\chi^{\xi^\perp} \cdot \delta p^H)^V$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\zeta \in \mathfrak{r}$ and $b \in \mathbf{S}$, and identify T_x^*Q with $\mathfrak{r}^* \oplus \mathbf{S}^*$ by the isomorphism* (3.6)*. Then,*

(i) $(T_x\chi^{\xi^\perp} \cdot \zeta_Q(x))^V =$
$\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}} \left[\left(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot \xi_Q^\perp(x)\right)(\zeta) + \mathrm{ad}^*_\zeta \mu + 2\left(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot \zeta_Q(x)\right)(\xi^\perp)\right], -\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{S}} \left[\left(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot (\cdot)\right)(\xi^\perp, \zeta)\right]\right).$

(ii) $(T_x\chi^{\xi^\perp} \cdot b)^V = \left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}} \left[\left(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot b\right)(\xi^\perp)\right], \ll C(b)(\xi^\perp), \cdot \gg_{\mathbf{S}}\right).$

Proof. The proof is just an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.1, in particular of items (i), (ii), (iv), and (v). We will just prove (ii). Recalling that ∇ is a metric connection, then

$$(T_x\chi^{\xi^\perp} \cdot b)^V = \nabla_{\overline{b}} \left(\mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}(\xi_Q^\perp)\right)(x) = \mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}(\nabla_{\overline{b}} \xi_Q^\perp)(x).$$

For $\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}$ we have, from item (iv) of Theorem 3.1

$$\langle (T_x\chi^{\xi^\perp} \cdot b)^V, \lambda_Q(x)\rangle = \ll \nabla_{\overline{b}} \xi_Q^\perp(x), \lambda_Q(x) \gg = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot b)(\xi^\perp, \lambda).$$

Similarly, if $w \in \mathbf{S}$, then by item (v) of the above referred theorem we have

$$\langle (T_x\chi^{\xi^\perp} \cdot b)^V, w\rangle = \ll \nabla_{\overline{b}} \xi_Q^\perp(x), w \gg = \ll C(b)(\xi^\perp), w \gg_{\mathbf{S}}.$$

This yields result (ii) The proof of (i) is identical, including some manipulations using the infinitesimal equivariance property of the locked inertia tensor given in (3.3). □

We apply now the results obtained so far in order to produce a singular version of the reduced Energy-Momentum Method of [19]. Consider $\mathcal{P} = T^*Q$ with its canonical symplectic form in the statement of Theorem 2.1, where $(Q, \ll \cdot, \cdot \gg)$ is a Riemannian manifold on which the Lie group G acts by isometries. The Hamiltonian action on T^*Q is the cotangent lift of the action on Q, and the Hamiltonian is given by (2.3) defining a simple mechanical system. Let ξ be an element of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G. Fix $p_x = \mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}(\xi_Q(x))$ with momentum μ. Assume that

(i) x is a critical point of V_ξ, and
(ii) G_μ is compact.

Then p_x is a relative equilibrium for our simple mechanical system with velocity ξ satisfying $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_\mu$ and Theorem 2.1 can be applied to study its G_μ-stability. That is, we need to determine when $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$ is definite. For that, we will use the characterization of the symplectic normal space V_s, given in (3.16) which establishes a linear isomorphism $\kappa : \mathfrak{q}^\mu \oplus \mathbf{S} \oplus \mathbf{S}^* \to V_s \subset T_{p_x}T^*Q \simeq (\mathfrak{r} \oplus \mathbf{S}) \oplus (\mathfrak{r}^* \oplus \mathbf{S}^*)$ explicitly expressed as

$$\kappa(\lambda, a, \gamma) = (\lambda, a \quad ; \quad \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}} \left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot \xi_Q^\perp(x))(\lambda) + \mathrm{ad}^*_\lambda \mu - (\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot a)(\xi^\perp)\right], \\ \gamma - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{S}} \left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot (\cdot))(\xi^\perp, \lambda)\right] + \ll C(a)(\xi^\perp), \cdot \gg_{\mathbf{S}}\big). \end{array} \tag{4.2}$$

This map is G_{p_x}-equivariant with respect to the action on $\mathfrak{q}^\mu \oplus \mathbf{S} \oplus \mathbf{S}^*$ given by

$$g \cdot (\lambda, a, \gamma) = (\mathrm{Ad}_g \lambda, g \cdot a, g \cdot \gamma),$$

and the action (3.9) on $(\mathfrak{r} \oplus \mathbf{S}) \oplus (\mathfrak{r}^* \oplus \mathbf{S}^*)$.

Definition 4.1. *At a relative equilibrium $p_x = \mathbb{FL}(\xi_Q(x))$, with momentum μ velocity $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_\mu$, define the linear subspace Σ of T_xQ isomorphic to $\mathfrak{q}^\mu \oplus \mathbf{S}$, as*

$$\Sigma = \{\lambda_Q(x) + a \in T_xQ \,:\, \lambda \in \mathfrak{q}^\mu,\, a \in \mathbf{S}\}\,, \tag{4.3}$$

where $\mathfrak{q}^\mu$ is defined in (3.15).
For any two vectors $v_1, v_2 \in T_xQ$, define the correction term as the symmetric bilinear form on T_xQ defined by

$$\mathrm{corr}_{\,\xi}(x)(v_1, v_2) = \langle \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot v_1)(\xi)\right], \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot v_2)(\xi)\right]\right)\rangle. \tag{4.4}$$

We can now state the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.1 (reduced Energy-Momentum Method)**.** *Suppose that $p_x = \mathbb{FL}(\xi_Q(x))$ is a relative equilibrium of the simple mechanical system* (2.3) *with momentum μ and velocity $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_\mu$. Assume that G_μ is compact, $G_x = H$ and that a $(H \cap G_\mu)$-invariant splitting $\mathfrak{g}_\mu = \mathfrak{g}_{p_x} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$. Let $\xi^\perp$ be the orthogonal projection of ξ onto $\mathfrak{p}$. Then if*

(i) $\dim Q - \dim G + \dim G_x > 0$, *and*
(ii) $\left(\mathbf{d}_x^2 V_{\xi^\perp} + \mathrm{corr}_{\,\xi^\perp}(x)\right)\big|_{\,\Sigma}$ *is positive definite*

or

(i) $\dim Q - \dim G + \dim G_x = 0$, *and*
(ii) $\left(\mathbf{d}_x^2 V_{\xi^\perp} + \mathrm{corr}_{\,\xi^\perp}(x)\right)\big|_{\,\Sigma}$ *is definite (positive or negative)*

then the relative equilibrium is G_μ-stable.

Proof. According to Theorem 2.1 the relative equilibrium is stable provided $\mathbf{d}_z^2 h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$ is definite. As both $K_{\xi^\perp}$ and $\overline{V_{\xi^\perp}}$ have a critical point at p_x ((*iii*) in Proposition 4.1), and since $h_{\xi^\perp} = K_{\xi^\perp} + \overline{V_{\xi^\perp}}$, then

$$\mathbf{d}_{p_x}^2 h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s} = \left(\mathbf{d}_{p_x}^2 K_{\xi^\perp} + \mathbf{d}_{p_x}^2 \overline{V_{\xi^\perp}}\right)\big|_{\,V_s}.$$

With the isomorphism κ in (4.2) we can compute each of these Hessians in V_s parameterized by elements in $\mathfrak{q}^\mu \oplus \mathbf{S} \oplus \mathbf{S}^*$.

Let us compute first $\mathbf{d}_{p_x} K_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$. Let $\lambda, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathfrak{q}^\mu$, $a, a_1, a_2 \in \mathbf{S}$ and $\beta, \beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbf{S}^*$. Note that using (4.2) we have that the vertical variation δp^V corresponding to an element $\lambda \in \mathfrak{q}^\mu$, i.e. $I(\delta p) = \kappa\,(\lambda, 0, 0)$, is

$$\delta p^V = \left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}\,\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot (\xi^\perp)_Q(x))(\lambda) + \mathrm{ad}_\lambda^* \mu\right], -\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{S}}[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot (\cdot))(\xi^\perp, \lambda)]\right).$$

Using Lemma 4.2 we have

$$\delta p^V - (T_x\chi^{\xi^\perp} \cdot \delta p^H)^V = \left(-\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}\,\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot \lambda_Q(x))(\xi^\perp)\right], 0\right).$$

Similarly, if $a \in \mathbf{S}$ we have for $I(\delta p) = \kappa\,(0, a, 0)$

$$\delta p^V = \left(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}\,\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot a)(\xi^\perp)\right], \ll C(a)(\xi^\perp), \cdot \gg_{\mathbf{S}}\right),$$

and then

$$\delta p^V - (T_x\chi^{\xi^\perp} \cdot \delta p^H)^V = \left(-\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}\,\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot a)(\xi^\perp)\right], 0\right).$$

Finally, if $\beta \in \mathbf{S}^*$ for $I(\delta p) = \kappa\,(0,0,\beta)$ we have $\delta p^V = (0,\beta)$ and $\delta p^H = (0,0)$ so

$$\delta p^V - (T_x\chi^{\xi^\perp}\cdot \delta p^H)^V = (0,\beta).$$

According to (ii) in Lemma 4.1 we can now write, for $\lambda, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathfrak{q}^\mu$, $a, a_1, a_2 \in \mathbf{S}$ and $\beta, \beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbf{S}^*$

$$\begin{array}{lcl}
\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} K_{\xi^\perp}(\kappa(\lambda_1,0,0),\kappa(\lambda_2,0,0)) & = & \langle \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\lambda_{1Q}(x))(\xi^\perp)], \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\lambda_{2Q}(x))(\xi^\perp)]\rangle \\
\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} K_{\xi^\perp}(\kappa(\lambda,0,0),\kappa(0,a,0)) & = & \langle \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\lambda_{Q}(x))(\xi^\perp)], \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot a)(\xi^\perp)]\rangle \\
\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} K_{\xi^\perp}(\kappa(0,a_1,0),\kappa(0,a_2,0)) & = & \langle \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot a_1)(\xi^\perp)], \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot a_2)(\xi^\perp)]\rangle \\
\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} K_{\xi^\perp}(\kappa(0,0,\beta_1),\kappa(0,0,\beta_2)) & = & \ll \beta_1, \beta_1 \gg_{\mathbf{S}^*} \\
\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} K_{\xi^\perp}(\kappa(0,0,\beta),\kappa(\lambda,0,0)) & = & 0 \\
\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} K_{\xi^\perp}(\kappa(0,0,\beta),\kappa(0,a,0)) & = & 0.
\end{array}$$

Where $\ll \cdot,\cdot \gg_{\mathbf{S}^*}$ is the inner product in $\mathbf{S}^*$ induced from $\ll \cdot,\cdot \gg_{\mathbf{S}}$ via the Riemannian Legendre map (2.2). We compute now the remaining contribution, the Hessian of the augmented potential energy. Using Lemma 4.1 it is immediate to obtain

$$\begin{array}{lcl}
\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x}\overline{V_{\xi^\perp}}(\kappa(\lambda_1,a_1,0),\kappa(\lambda_2,a_2,0)) & = & \mathbf{d}^2_x V_{\xi^\perp}(\lambda_{1Q}(x)+a_1, \lambda_{2Q}(x)+a_2) \\
\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x}\overline{V_{\xi^\perp}}(\kappa(\lambda,a,0),\kappa(0,0,\beta)) & = & 0 \\
\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x}\overline{V_{\xi^\perp}}(\kappa(0,0,\beta_1),\kappa(0,0,\beta_2)) & = & 0
\end{array}$$

for every $\lambda, \lambda_1\lambda_2 \in \mathfrak{q}^\mu$, $a, a_1, a_2 \in \mathbf{S}$, $\beta, \beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbf{S}^*$.

Therefore, $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$ block-diagonalizes in the two blocks $\kappa(\mathfrak{q}^\mu \oplus \mathbf{S} \oplus \{0\})$ and $\kappa(\{0\}\oplus\{0\}\oplus\mathbf{S}^*)$ as

$$\begin{array}{lcl}
\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}(\kappa(\lambda_1,a_1,0),\kappa(\lambda_2,a_2,0)) & = & \left(\mathbf{d}^2_x V_{\xi^\perp} + \operatorname{corr}_{\xi^\perp}(x)\right)(\lambda_{1Q}(x)+a_1, \lambda_{2Q}(x)+a_2) \\
\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}(\kappa(\lambda,a,0),\kappa(0,0,\beta)) & = & 0 \\
\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}(\kappa(0,0,\beta_1),\kappa(0,0,\beta_2)) & = & \ll \beta_1, \beta_1 \gg_{\mathbf{S}^*}
\end{array}$$

for every $\lambda, \lambda_1\lambda_2 \in \mathfrak{q}^\mu$, $a, a_1, a_2 \in \mathbf{S}$, $\beta, \beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbf{S}^*$. From the above expression and Definition 4.1 it follows that the bilinear form $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$ is equivalent to the pair of bilinear forms $\left(\mathbf{d}^2_x V_{\xi^\perp} + \operatorname{corr}_{\xi^\perp}(x)\right)\big|_{\Sigma}$ and $\ll \cdot,\cdot \gg_{\mathbf{S}^*}$.

Let us examine now when $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$ is definite. Since the block $\ll \cdot,\cdot \gg_{\mathbf{S}^*}$ is positive-definite or trivial, there are two possible scenarios. (i) $\dim \mathbf{S} = 0$ and (ii) $\dim \mathbf{S} > 0$. Note that $\dim \mathbf{S} = 0$ if and only if the dimension of the orbit $G\cdot x$ equals $\dim Q$. Recall also that $\dim G\cdot x = \dim G - \dim G_x$. In this case $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$ consists only in the block $\left(\mathbf{d}^2_x V_{\xi^\perp} + \operatorname{corr}_{\xi^\perp}(x)\right)\big|_{\Sigma}$ and the relative equilibrium is G_μ-stable provided this block is definite (positive or negative).

For the other possibility, if $\dim \mathbf{S} \neq 0$ then $\dim Q > \dim G\cdot x$ and the block $\ll \cdot,\cdot \gg_{\mathbf{S}^*}$ is positive definite since the metric on Q is Riemannian, so $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$ is definite if and only if the block $\left(\mathbf{d}^2_x V_{\xi^\perp} + \operatorname{corr}_{\xi^\perp}(x)\right)\big|_{\Sigma}$ is positive definite. This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Remarks.

- It is easy to see that the above theorem particularizes in the regular case ($G_{p_x} = G_x = 0$) to the main result of the reduced Energy-Momentum Method, (see page 35 in [19]). In the regular case, one has to test the stability of the Hessian $\mathbf{d}^2_x V_\mu$ restricted to $(\mathfrak{g}_\mu\cdot x)^\perp$, where μ is the momentum

value of the relative equilibrium under study and V_μ is Smale's *amended potential energy* (see [20]), defined as

$$V_\mu(x) = V(x) + \frac{1}{2}\langle \mu, \mathbb{I}^{-1}(x)(\mu)\rangle.$$

Obviously this function is not well defined at those points $x \in Q$ such that $\dim \mathfrak{g}_x > 0$, since the locked inertia tensor is not invertible. Hence, it is not possible to define the Hessian of the amended potential in the singular setting. However, the following relation is to be noted (see [19], equation (2.28)), which holds in the regular case at a relative equilibrium

$$\mathbf{d}_x^2 V_\mu(v_1, v_2) = \mathbf{d}_x^2 V_\xi(v_1, v_2) + \langle (\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot v_1)(\xi), \mathbb{I}^{-1}(x)\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot v_2)(\xi)\right]\rangle.$$

This suggests that what we are testing in Theorem 4.1 is exactly the singular analogue of the Hessian of the amended potential, even when we cannot talk about the amended potential itself.

- In the regular case, according to our definition (3.14) of $\mathfrak{t}$, $\Sigma = (\mathfrak{g}_\mu \cdot x)^\perp$ with respect to $\ll \cdot, \cdot \gg$. In the presence of isotropy for the base point x of our relative equilibria, it can be seen that Σ is the orthogonal complement to $\mathfrak{g}_\mu \cdot x$ within the space of admissible variations (see (7.1) and the proof of Proposition 6.1). Therefore, conditions (ii) in Theorem 4.1 are tested in a space Σ which is orthogonally complementary (with respect to the kinetic energy metric) to the drift orbit $G_\mu \cdot x$.

5. An example: The sleeping Lagrange top

We will apply our singular version of the reduced Energy-Momentum Method to the study of the relative equilibrium known as the *sleeping Lagrange top*. This problem has been extensively studied in the literature of Classical Mechanics; see in particular [8] for a geometric perspective of the problem using the Hamiltonian and symplectic formalism. Here we show the advantages of the method stated in Theorem 4.1 when studying stability in simple mechanical systems. Indeed, taking into account the extra cotangent bundle structure of the problem actually leads to simpler calculations for obtaining stability results when compared with the non-adapted methods constructed for general symmetric Hamiltonian systems.

The Lagrange top is a symmetric simple mechanical system defined on the configuration space $Q = \mathrm{SO}(3)$, in the usual representation by orthogonal 3×3 real matrices with determinant 1, and being the symmetry group $G = \mathbb{T}^2$. We use the right trivialization for $T\mathrm{SO}(3)$ given by the isomorphism $T\mathrm{SO}(3) \to \mathfrak{so}(3) \times \mathrm{SO}(3)$, i.e. $\delta g = \xi g$ with $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$, and identifying $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ with $\mathbb{R}^3$ under the inverse of the usual isomorphism given by $\mathbb{R}^3 \ni \mathbf{u} \to \hat{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ (as a 3×3 matrix algebra), defined by $\hat{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{v}$, $\forall\, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Analogous considerations hold to obtain the trivialization of the phase space for the problem: $T^*\mathrm{SO}(3) \to \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathrm{SO}(3)$. Then we can write the Hamiltonian for this system as

$$H(\pi, \Lambda) = \frac{1}{2}\pi \cdot E_\Lambda^{-1}\pi + mgl\Lambda\mathbf{e_3}\cdot\mathbf{e_3}, \tag{5.1}$$

where $\Lambda \in Q$, $\pi \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and $(\pi, \Lambda) \in T^*_\Lambda Q$, $E = \mathrm{diag}\,(i, i, i_3)$ and $E_\Lambda = \Lambda E \Lambda^t$. Finally, m, g, l are physical constants of the model.

The group $\mathbb{T}^2$ is identified with $S^1 \times S^1$ where, in our matricial representation, both copies of the circle group act by rotations around $\mathbf{e_3}$. Its action on Q is given by $(L, R)\cdot\Lambda = L\Lambda R^t$ and the action on the phase space is by cotangent lifts. We

do not actually need the (simple) expression for the cotangent-lifted action since our methods rely finally on the geometry of the action of G on Q once they were constructed in this spirit. Let $(l,r)\in\mathbb{R}^2=\mathrm{Lie}\,(\mathbb{T}^2)$, then the infinitesimal action of $\mathbb{R}^2$ on Q is given in the right trivialization of $T\mathrm{SO}(3)$ by $(l,r)_Q(\Lambda)=(l\mathbf{e_3}-r\Lambda\mathbf{e_3},\Lambda)$.

To finish with these preliminaries, let us show the Riemannian structure of Q associated to the kinetic energy of the problem. If $V_1=(v_1,\Lambda)$ and $V_2=(v_2,\Lambda)$ are two tangent vectors to Q at Λ, then

$$\ll V_1,V_2\gg(\Lambda)=v_1\cdot E_\Lambda v_2 \tag{5.2}$$

which is easily checked to be a $\mathbb{T}^2$-invariant symmetric contravariant bilinear tensor on Q. Note also from the expression (5.1) of the Hamiltonian, that the potential energy is given by $V(\Lambda)=mgl\Lambda\mathbf{e_3}\cdot\mathbf{e_3}$.

It is well known that the phase space point $p_I=\mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}((l,r)_Q(I))$, where I is the identity 3×3 matrix, is a relative equilibrium of this system, known as the sleeping Lagrange top. Our aim is to study its stability. First of all, note that since $\Lambda=I$, then $(l,r)_Q(I)=(\zeta\mathbf{e_3},I)$, where the number $\zeta=l-r$ uniquely determines the infinitesimal generator, and it is physically interpreted as the angular velocity of the rigid body modelled by this system.

The first thing we need to compute is the locked inertia tensor. It easily follows from the previous expressions that

$$\ll(l_1,r_1)_Q(\Lambda),(l_2,r_2)_Q(\Lambda)\gg=(l_1\mathbf{e_3}-r_1\Lambda\mathbf{e_3})\cdot E_\Lambda(l_2\mathbf{e_3}-r_2\Lambda\mathbf{e_3})$$

$$=(l_1,r_1)\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{e_3}\cdot E_\Lambda\mathbf{e_3} & -\mathbf{e_3}\cdot\Lambda E\mathbf{e_3}\\ -\mathbf{e_3}\cdot E\Lambda^t\mathbf{e_3} & \mathbf{e_3}\cdot E\mathbf{e_3}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}l_2\\ r_2\end{pmatrix}$$

and then

$$\mathbb{I}(\Lambda)=\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{e_3}\cdot E_\Lambda\mathbf{e_3} & -\mathbf{e_3}\cdot\Lambda E\mathbf{e_3}\\ -\mathbf{e_3}\cdot E\Lambda^t\mathbf{e_3} & \mathbf{e_3}\cdot E\mathbf{e_3}\end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus at the configuration $\Lambda=I$ of our relative equilibrium we have

$$\mathbb{I}(I)=\begin{pmatrix}i_3 & -i_3\\ -i_3 & i_3\end{pmatrix}$$

and so the momentum value of the relative equilibrium is

$$\mu=\mathbb{I}(I)(l,r)=i_3(\zeta,-\zeta).$$

As the configuration point of our relative equilibrium is the identity element of $\mathrm{SO}(3)$, then its isotropy group is $H=G_I=S^1$, regarded as the diagonal embedding of S^1 in the 2-torus. For the momentum isotropy, just by noting that the group is Abelian and thus the coadjoint representation is trivial, we obtain $G_\mu=\mathbb{T}^2$. Finally, using the characterization $G_{p_x}=G_x\cap G_\mu$ we also get $G_{p_x}=G_x=S^1$.

The next step is to choose a G_{p_x}-invariant complement to $\mathfrak{g}_{p_x}$ in $\mathfrak{g}_\mu=\mathbb{R}^2$ in order to implement the splitting (3.13) and obtain the velocity $(l,r)^\perp$. We will obtain it by orthogonality with respect to a G_{p_x}-invariant inner product in $\mathfrak{g}_\mu$. Since the adjoint action is also trivial any inner product is S^1-invariant. We can choose the family of inner products

$$\mathbf{G}=\begin{pmatrix}k & 0\\ 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\mathfrak{g}_{p_x}$ is generated by $(1,1)$, its orthogonal complement $\mathfrak{p}$ with respect to $\mathbf{G}$ is generated by the normalized vector $\mathbf{k}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{k(1+k)}}(1,-k)$, so for the infinitesimal

generator of our relative equilibrium, $\xi = (l, r)$, we have that $\xi^\perp$ is the orthogonal projection of ξ onto $\mathfrak{p}$, i.e. $\xi^\perp = \mathbf{G}(\xi, \mathbf{k})\mathbf{k} = \zeta\left(\frac{1}{1+k}, -\frac{k}{1+k}\right)$.
The augmented potential energy $V_{\xi^\perp}(\Lambda) = V(\Lambda) - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I}(\Lambda)(\xi^\perp, \xi^\perp)$ corresponding to this relative equilibrium is now written as

$$V_{\xi^\perp}(\Lambda) = mgl\Lambda\mathbf{e_3}\cdot\mathbf{e_3} - \frac{\zeta^2}{2(1+k)^2}\left[\mathbf{e_3}\cdot E_\Lambda\mathbf{e_3} + 2ki_3\mathbf{e_3}\cdot\Lambda\mathbf{e_3} + k^2 i_3\right].$$

We now compute the derivative of the augmented potential. According to our right trivialization, a tangent vector $\delta\Lambda \in T_\Lambda \mathrm{SO}(3)$ can be written as $\delta\Lambda = \hat{\epsilon}\Lambda$, where ϵ is a vector in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Then, after some vector calculus manipulations we get
(5.3)

$$\mathbf{d}V_{\xi^\perp}(\Lambda)\cdot\delta\Lambda = mgl\mathbf{e_3}\cdot(\epsilon\times\Lambda\mathbf{e_3}) - \frac{\zeta^2}{(1+k)^2}\left[ki_3\mathbf{e_3}\cdot(\epsilon\times\Lambda\mathbf{e_3}) - \mathbf{e_3}\cdot E_\Lambda(\epsilon\times\mathbf{e_3})\right]$$

which vanishes at $\Lambda = I$, since $\mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}((l,r)_Q(I))$ is a relative equilibrium. The Hessian of $V_{\xi^\perp}$ at $\Lambda = I$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{d}_I^2 V_{\xi^\perp}(\delta\Lambda_1, \delta\Lambda_2) = (\epsilon_1\times\mathbf{e_3})\cdot(\epsilon_2\times\mathbf{e_3})\left(\tfrac{(ki_3+i_3)\zeta^2}{(1+k)^2} - mgl\right)\\ -\tfrac{\zeta^2}{(1+k)^2}(\epsilon_1\times\mathbf{e_3})\cdot E(\epsilon_2\times\mathbf{e_3}).\end{aligned}$$

A straightforward computation shows that the correction term (4.4) vanishes.

As the group is Abelian, then $\mathfrak{g}_\mu = \mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{q}^\mu = (0,0)$, so $\Sigma = \mathbf{S}$. Then by Theorem 4.1 the relative equilibrium is G_μ-stable if $\mathbf{d}_I^2 V_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{\mathbf{S}}$ is positive-definite. It is then necessary to obtain the linear slice for the toral action on $\mathrm{SO}(3)$ at $\Lambda = I$ with respect to the Riemannian metric (5.2). A tangent vector $\delta\Lambda \in T_I\mathrm{SO}(3)$ written as $\delta\Lambda = \hat{\epsilon}I$ is orthogonal to $\mathfrak{g}\cdot I$ if and only if

$$\epsilon\cdot E\mathbf{e_3} = 0$$

and thus we have

$$\mathbf{S} = \{\delta\Lambda \in T_I\mathrm{SO}(3) \,:\, \epsilon \in \mathrm{span}\{(1,0,0),(0,1,0)\}\}.$$

To check the positive definiteness of $\mathbf{d}_I^2 V_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{\mathbf{S}}$ is then equivalent to showing that the 2×2 matrix

$$\left(\frac{(ki_3 + i_3 - i)\zeta^2}{(1+k)^2} - mgl\right) I_2 \tag{5.4}$$

is positive-definite, where I_2 is the identity matrix in $\mathbb{R}^2$; so the condition for stability is satisfied if

$$\zeta^2 > \frac{(1+k)^2 mgl}{ki_3 + i_3 - i} \tag{5.5}$$

Remark. The above expression is exactly the one obtained in [11], page 718, by using the (singular) Energy-Momentum Method for general Hamiltonian systems in arbitrary symplectic manifolds, i.e. Theorem 2.1 in this paper. In that work, the same condition for the $\mathbb{T}^2$-stability of the sleeping Lagrange top is obtained after computing algebraically the eigenvalues of a 4×4 matrix $(\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_\xi\big|_{V_s})$, which was not put in block-diagonal form by applying their general stability criterion. With our method the same expression follows easily from the unique eigenvalue of the scalar matrix (5.4). This shows the potential power of employing methods adapted to the cotangent bundle structure in the study of simple mechanical systems. In particular

in practical stability problems with higher dimensional configuration spaces the implementation of Theorem 2.1 could involve checking the definiteness of much more complicated matrices, forcing the use of numerical methods in some situations where the reduced Energy-Momentum Method developed in this paper (Theorem 4.1 and also Corollary 6.2) could offer simpler or even exact results.

For the sake of completeness we will sharpen the stability condition (5.5), following [11]. Since in the stability condition k appears, which is related to $\mathbf{G}$, the sharpest (or optimal) stability condition will be the lowest value of ζ^2 among all possible k. This is an straightforward optimization problem in elementary calculus, so by differentiating the expression

$$f(k) = \frac{(1+k)^2 mgl}{ki_3 + i_3 - i},$$

we find that the minimum value is reached at $k = \frac{2i-i_3}{i_3}$. So the sharpest stability condition yields the well-known lower bound for the angular velocity

$$\zeta^2 > \frac{4mgli}{i_3^2}.$$

6. The singular Arnold form and Block-Diagonalization

In the previous section we used the realization of the symplectic normal space V_s at a relative equilibrium given in (3.16) and which has been shown to be isomorphic to $\mathfrak{q}^\mu \oplus \mathbf{S} \oplus \mathbf{S}^*$ by the isomorphism (4.2). This was helpful to simplify the study of the definiteness of $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$, obtaining a block-diagonal structure with one block being positive-definite or trivial, reducing the problem to study the definiteness of $\left(\mathbf{d}^2_x V_{\xi^\perp} + \operatorname{corr}_{\xi^\perp}(x)\right)\big|_\Sigma$. In this section we pursue the study of the symplectic normal space V_s by obtaining new block-diagonal forms for $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$ and also for the symplectic matrix Ω at a relative equilibrium. Recall that in the I-representation, the symplectic matrix $\omega(p_x)$ of $T_{p_x}(T^*Q)$ has the following form (see [13] and [17]). If $(\eta_1, a_1;\, \nu_1, \alpha_1)$, $(\eta_2, a_2;\, \nu_2, \alpha_2) \in I(T_{p_x}(T^*Q)) = (\mathfrak{r} \oplus \mathbf{S}) \oplus (\mathfrak{r}^* \oplus \mathbf{S}^*)$ then

$$\Omega\left((\eta_1, a_1;\, \nu_1, \alpha_1), (\eta_2, a_2;\, \nu_2, \alpha_2)\right) = \langle \nu_2, \eta_1\rangle + \langle \alpha_2, a_1\rangle - \langle \nu_1, \eta_2\rangle - \langle \alpha_1, a_2\rangle. \tag{6.1}$$

In the following we will use a parametrization of V_s different from (4.2). This, when available, will present the extra advantage of putting $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$ in block-diagonal form consisting of three blocks instead of two, as in Theorem 4.1, hence simplifying the stability analysis further. We will start by defining a singular analogue of the Arnold form, (see [1] and [9] to see how the Arnold form arises in the study of the stability of regular relative equilibria of simple mechanical systems). Hereafter, we assume that we will be working under the same conditions and hypotheses as in the previous section. In particular, we will always have $p_x = \mathbb{FL}(\xi_Q(x))$ as a relative equilibrium of the simple mechanical system (2.3) with momentum μ and base point isotropy $G_x = H$.

Definition 6.1. *The singular Arnold form at a relative equilibrium with base point x and momentum μ is the bilinear form on $\mathfrak{q}^\mu$, $\operatorname{Ar} : \mathfrak{q}^\mu \times \mathfrak{q}^\mu \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by*

$$\operatorname{Ar}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \langle \operatorname{ad}^*_{\lambda_1}\mu, \Lambda(x,\mu)(\lambda_2)\rangle,$$

where the map $\Lambda(x,\mu) : \mathfrak{q}^\mu \to \mathfrak{r}$ is defined by

$$\Lambda(x,\mu)(\lambda) = \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\left(\operatorname{ad}^*_\lambda \mu\right) + \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}^*}\left[\operatorname{ad}_\lambda\left(\hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\mu\right)\right].$$

Remark. To the best of our knowledge, the first time a singular analogue of the Arnold form appears in the literature is in [6], equation (3.56), under the name of "generalized Arnold form". In that work, this object is defined in the context of general Lagrangian systems and the Lagrangian Block-Diagonalization method. Also see Section 7 for a comparison of other results in [6].

We will now define another two spaces which will be useful for the obtention of block-diagonal expressions. The motivation for the introduction of these spaces is, following the ideas in [19], that provided a non-degeneracy condition is satisfied, $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$ will further block-diagonalized, refining the conditions of Theorem 4.1.

Recalling the identification $\kappa : \mathfrak{q}^\mu \oplus \mathbf{S} \oplus \mathbf{S}^* \to V_s$, let us define the following subspace of $\mathfrak{q}^\mu \oplus \mathbf{S}$:

$$w_{\text{int}} = \left\{(\lambda^b, b) \in \mathfrak{q}^\mu \oplus \mathbf{S} \,:\, (\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot (\lambda^b_Q(x) + b))(\xi^\perp) \in \mathfrak{p}^*\right\}. \tag{6.2}$$

Also, using the map $(\lambda, b) \mapsto \lambda_Q(x) + b$ which maps isomorphically $\mathfrak{q}^\mu \oplus \mathbf{S}$ onto $\Sigma \subset T_xQ$, we define the following subspaces of Σ:

$$\Sigma_{\text{rig}} = \left\{\lambda_Q(x) \,:\, \lambda \in \mathfrak{q}^\mu\right\}, \quad \text{and} \tag{6.3}$$

$$\Sigma_{\text{int}} = \left\{\lambda^b_Q(x) + b \,:\, (\lambda^b, b) \in w_{\text{int}}\right\}. \tag{6.4}$$

Note that we have the following obvious identifications:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \Sigma_{\text{rig}} & \simeq & \mathfrak{q}^\mu \\ \Sigma_{\text{int}} & \simeq & w_{\text{int}}. \end{array}$$

Following [19] we can give the following interpretation for these two spaces: Σ is seen as the space of all admissible variations orthogonal to the infinitesimal drift directions $\mathfrak{g}_\mu \cdot x$. This space has a contribution Σ_{rig} which corresponds to variations in Σ which generate group motions, i.e. regarding our systems as a "rigid body" without internal structure. On the contrary, the subspace Σ_{int} corresponds to all the variations of our system that are purely internal, i.e. variations in "shape", not coming from the symmetry group.

Proposition 6.1. *If the Arnold form is non-degenerate then* $\Sigma = \Sigma_{\text{rig}} \oplus \Sigma_{\text{int}}$.

For the proof of this proposition, we will need the following lemma

Lemma 6.1. *For every* $\lambda \in \mathfrak{q}^\mu$ *and* $v \in \mathbf{S}$

(i) $\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{h}} \left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot \lambda_Q(x))(\xi^\perp)\right] = 0$
(ii) $\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{h}} \left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot v)(\xi^\perp)\right] = 0.$

Proof. For (i), using (3.3), for any $\zeta \in \mathfrak{h}$ one has

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot \lambda_Q(x))(\xi^\perp, \zeta) & = & -\mathbb{I}(x)(\mathrm{ad}_\lambda \xi^\perp, \zeta) - \mathbb{I}(\xi^\perp, \mathrm{ad}_\lambda \zeta) \\ & = & -\langle \mathrm{ad}^*_\lambda \mu, \zeta\rangle = 0, \end{array}$$

where the second equality follows since $\ker \mathbb{I}(x) = \mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathbb{I}(x)(\xi^\perp) = \mu$.
For (ii), making $\lambda = \zeta \in \mathfrak{h}$ in item (iii) of Theorem 3.1, we have $(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I} \cdot v)(\xi^\perp, \zeta) = 0$ for every $\zeta \in \mathfrak{h}$. □

Proof. (of the proposition) It is clear that $\Sigma_{\text{rig}} \subset \Sigma$ and $\Sigma_{\text{int}} \subset \Sigma$ so we have to prove $\Sigma_{\text{rig}} \cap \Sigma_{\text{int}} = 0$ and $\Sigma_{\text{rig}} + \Sigma_{\text{int}} = \Sigma$. Let $0 \neq \lambda \in \mathfrak{q}^\mu$. Then $\lambda_Q(x) \in \Sigma_{\text{rig}} \cap \Sigma_{\text{int}}$ if and only if $(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}(x) \cdot \lambda_Q(x))(\xi^\perp, \epsilon) = 0$ for every $\epsilon \in \mathfrak{t} + \mathfrak{h}$. By (i) in Lemma 6.1,

this holds if and only if the same condition is satisfied for every $\epsilon \in \mathfrak{t}$. Using (3.3), this is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathbb{I}(x)(\mathrm{ad}_\lambda \xi^\perp, \epsilon) + \mathbb{I}(x)(\xi^\perp, \mathrm{ad}_\lambda \epsilon) = \langle \mathbb{I}(x)\left(\mathrm{ad}_\lambda\left(\hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\mu\right)\right) + \mathrm{ad}^*_\lambda \mu, \epsilon\rangle \\ &= \langle \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0\left(\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}^*}\left[\mathrm{ad}_\lambda\left(\hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\mu\right)\right]\right) + \mathrm{ad}^*_\lambda\mu, \epsilon\rangle = \langle \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0\left(\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}^*}\left[\left(\mathrm{ad}_\lambda \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\mu\right)\right] + \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}(\mathrm{ad}^*_\lambda\mu)\right), \epsilon\rangle \end{aligned}$$

for every $\epsilon \in \mathfrak{t}$, regarding that $\mathrm{ad}^*_\lambda \mu \in \mathfrak{r}$ if $\lambda \in \mathfrak{q}^\mu$. Since $\hat{\mathbb{I}}_0$ is an isomorphism, this condition is the same as $\Lambda(x,\mu)(\lambda) \in \mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{g}_\mu$, but then the Arnold form would be degenerate, which is a contradiction.

To prove that $\Sigma_{\mathrm{rig}} + \Sigma_{\mathrm{int}} = \Sigma$ let us note the following: if we call

$$\mathcal{D} = \left\{\delta q \in T_xQ \,:\, \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{h}}\,\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\delta q)(\xi^\perp)\right] = 0\right\},$$

then by the definitions of $\mathfrak{t}$ (3.14), $\mathfrak{q}^\mu$ (3.15), and by Lemma 6.1 we have that Σ is precisely the orthogonal complement to $\mathfrak{g}_\mu \cdot x$ in $\mathcal{D}$. The rest of the proof is then a consequence of Proposition 3.7 in [6]. □

Corollary 6.1. *If the Arnold form is non-degenerate then the map $\tilde{\kappa} : \mathfrak{q}^\mu \oplus \Sigma_{\mathrm{int}} \oplus \mathbf{S}^* \to V_s$ defined as*

$$\tilde{\kappa}(\lambda, (\lambda^a_Q(x) + a), \gamma) = \kappa(\lambda + \lambda^a, a, \gamma) \tag{6.5}$$

for every $\lambda \in \mathfrak{q}^\mu$, $(\lambda^a, a) \in w_{\mathrm{int}}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbf{S}^*$ is a G_{p_x}-equivariant isomorphism.

We will assume now that the Arnold form is non-degenerate and then we will study the symplectic matrix Ω of V_s and $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}$.

Proposition 6.2 (Block-Diagonalization forms)**.** *If the Arnold form is non-degenerate, under the isomorphism $\tilde{\kappa}$ of Corollary 6.1 we have the following expressions for the symplectic matrix Ω and $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$:*

$$\Omega = \begin{array}{c} \begin{matrix} \mathfrak{q}^\mu & \Sigma_{\mathrm{int}} & \mathbf{S}^* \end{matrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} \Xi & -\Psi & 0 \\ \Psi^t & S_\mu & \mathbf{1} \\ 0 & -\mathbf{1} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \tag{6.6}$$

and

$$\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s} = \begin{array}{c} \begin{matrix} \mathfrak{q}^\mu & \Sigma_{\mathrm{int}} & \mathbf{S}^* \end{matrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Ar} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (\mathbf{d}^2_x V_{\xi^\perp} + \mathrm{corr}_{\,\xi^\perp}(x))\big|_{\Sigma_{\mathrm{int}}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ll\cdot,\cdot\gg_{\mathbf{S}^*} \end{pmatrix} \end{array}, \tag{6.7}$$

where the entries of Ω are

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &= -\langle \mu, \mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_1}\lambda_2\rangle \\ \Psi(\lambda, (\lambda^b_Q(x) + b)) &= \langle \mu, \mathrm{ad}_\lambda \lambda^b\rangle \\ S_\mu((\lambda^a_Q(x) + a), (\lambda^b_Q(x) + b)) &= -\langle \mu, \mathrm{ad}_{\lambda^a}\lambda^b\rangle + \ll C(b)(\xi^\perp), a \gg_{\mathbf{S}} \\ &\quad - \ll C(a)(\xi^\perp), b\gg_{\mathbf{S}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The form for Ω follows trivially from (6.1) and the definition of $\tilde{k}$ from (6.5). For $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$, and recalling its block-diagonal form showed in the proof of Theorem 4.1, the only two things that we must check are

(i) $(\mathbf{d}^2_x V_{\xi^\perp} + \mathrm{corr}_{\,\xi^\perp}(x))(\lambda_{1Q}(x), \lambda_{2Q}(x)) = \mathrm{Ar}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$, and
(ii) $(\mathbf{d}^2_x V_{\xi^\perp} + \mathrm{corr}_{\,\xi^\perp}(x))(\lambda_Q(x), \delta q) = 0$,

for $\lambda, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathfrak{q}^\mu$ and $\delta q \in \Sigma_{\rm int}$.

To prove (i) recall that the potential energy V is G-invariant and then

$$(\mathbf{d}_x^2 V_{\xi^\perp} + \mathrm{corr}_{\,\xi^\perp}(x))(\lambda_{1Q}(x), \lambda_{2Q}(x)) = \left(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{d}_x^2\left(\mathbb{I}(x)(\xi^\perp,\xi^\perp)\right) + \mathrm{corr}_{\,\xi^\perp}(x)\right)(\lambda_{1Q}(x), \lambda_{2Q}(x)).$$

We compute now both terms in the right hand side of the above expression. For the first one,

$$\begin{aligned} -\tfrac{1}{2}\mathbf{d}_x^2\left(\mathbb{I}(x)(\xi^\perp,\xi^\perp)\right)(\lambda_{1Q}(x), \lambda_{2Q}(x)) &= -\tfrac{1}{2}\lambda_{2Q}((\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\lambda_{1Q}(x))(\xi^\perp,\xi^\perp))(x) \\ &= \lambda_{2Q}(\mathbb{I}(\mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_1}\xi^\perp,\xi^\perp))(x) \\ &= (\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\lambda_{2Q}(x))(\mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_1}\xi^\perp,\xi^\perp) \\ &= -\mathbb{I}(x)(\mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_2}(\mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_1}\xi^\perp),\xi^\perp) \\ &\quad -\mathbb{I}(x)(\mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_1}\xi^\perp,\mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_2}\xi^\perp). \end{aligned}$$

Now for the second,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{corr}_{\,\xi^\perp}(x)(\lambda_{1Q}(x), \lambda_{2Q}(x)) &= \langle \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\lambda_{1Q}(x))(\xi^\perp)\right], \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\lambda_{2Q}(x))(\xi^\perp)\right]\rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbb{I}(x)(\mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_1}\xi^\perp) + \mathrm{ad}^*_{\lambda_1}\mu, \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\left[\mathbb{I}(x)(\mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_2}\xi^\perp) + \mathrm{ad}^*_{\lambda_2}\mu\right]\rangle \\ &= \mathbb{I}(x)(\mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_2}\xi^\perp, \mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_1}\xi^\perp) + \langle \mathrm{ad}^*_{\lambda_1}\mu, \mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_2}\xi^\perp\rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \mathrm{ad}^*_{\lambda_2}\mu, \mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_1}\xi^\perp\rangle + \langle \mathrm{ad}^*_{\lambda_1}\mu, \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}(\mathrm{ad}^*_{\lambda_2}\mu)\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\mathbb{I}(x)(\eta_1,\eta_2) = \mathbb{I}(x)(\eta_1^{\mathfrak{r}},\eta_2^{\mathfrak{r}})\ \forall\, \eta_1,\eta_2 \in \mathfrak{g}$, since $\ker \mathbb{I}(x) = \mathfrak{h}$. Also, $\langle \mathrm{ad}^*_\lambda\mu, \eta\rangle = \langle \mathrm{ad}^*_\lambda\mu, \eta^{\mathfrak{r}}\rangle\ \forall\, \eta \in \mathfrak{g}$, since $\lambda \in \mathfrak{q}^\mu$, which means that $\mathrm{ad}^*_\lambda\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^\circ$. Finally, noticing that

$$\langle \mathrm{ad}^*_{\lambda_2}\mu, \mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_1}\xi^\perp\rangle = \mathbb{I}(x)(\xi^\perp, \mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_2}(\mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_1}\xi^\perp)),$$

and putting both contributions together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{d}_x^2 V_{\xi^\perp} + \mathrm{corr}_{\,\xi^\perp}(x))(\lambda_{1Q}(x), \lambda_{2Q}(x)) &= \langle \mathrm{ad}^*_{\lambda_1}\mu, \mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_2}\xi^\perp + \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}(\mathrm{ad}^*_{\lambda_2}\mu)\rangle \\ &= \langle \mathrm{ad}^*_{\lambda_1}\mu, \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}\left[\mathrm{ad}_{\lambda_2}\left(\hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\mu\right)\right] + \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}(\mathrm{ad}^*_{\lambda_2}\mu)\rangle \\ &= \mathrm{Ar}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2), \end{aligned}$$

since $\mathrm{ad}^*_{\lambda_1}\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^\circ$ and $\xi^\perp = \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\mu$.

Again for (ii) because the potential energy V is G-invariant we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\mathbf{d}_x^2 V_{\xi^\perp} + \mathrm{corr}_{\,\xi^\perp}(x)\right)(\lambda_Q(x), \lambda^a_Q(x) + a) = \\ &= \left(-\tfrac{1}{2}\mathbf{d}_x^2\left(\mathbb{I}(x)(\xi^\perp,\xi^\perp)\right) + \mathrm{corr}_{\,\xi^\perp}(x)\right)(\lambda_Q(x), \lambda^a_Q(x) + a). \end{aligned}$$

We will start by computing the contribution of the correction term:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{corr}_{\,\xi^\perp}(x)(\lambda, \lambda^a_Q(x) + a) &= \langle \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\lambda_Q(x))(\xi^\perp)\right], \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot(\lambda^a_Q(x)+a))(\xi^\perp)\right]\rangle \\ &= -\langle \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}\left[\mathbb{I}(x)(\mathrm{ad}_\lambda\xi^\perp)\right] + \mathrm{ad}^*_\lambda\mu, \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{r}}\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot(\lambda^a_Q(x)+a))(\xi^\perp)\right]\rangle \\ &= -\langle \mathbb{I}(x)(\mathrm{ad}_\lambda\xi^\perp) + \mathrm{ad}^*_\lambda\mu, \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot(\lambda^a_Q(x)+a)(\xi^\perp)\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

since $\ker \mathbb{I}(x) = \mathfrak{h}$ and by Lemma 6.1 $\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{h}}\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot(\lambda^a_Q(x)+a)(\xi^\perp)\right] = 0$. For the first term we have

$$-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{d}_x^2\left(\mathbb{I}(x)(\xi^\perp,\xi^\perp)\right)(\lambda, \lambda^a_Q(x)+a) = (\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot(\lambda^a_Q(x)+a))(\mathrm{ad}_\lambda\xi^\perp,\xi^\perp),$$

and so we finally obtain

$$\left(\mathbf{d}_x^2 V_{\xi^\perp} + \mathrm{corr}_{\,\xi^\perp}(x)\right)(\lambda_Q(x), \lambda^a_Q(x)+a) = -\langle \mathrm{ad}^*_\lambda\mu, \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot(\lambda^a_Q(x)+a)(\xi^\perp)\rangle.$$

This expression is zero since by construction $(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot(\lambda_Q^a(x)+a))(\xi^\perp)$ annihilates $\mathfrak{t}$ if $(\lambda^a,a)\in w_{\text{int}}$ and $\hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}(\text{ad}^*_\lambda\mu)\in\mathfrak{t}$ for every $\lambda\in\mathfrak{q}^\mu$. To see this, note that the image of $\hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}$ is in $\mathfrak{r}$ and hence $\mathbb{I}(x)(\hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}(\text{ad}^*_\lambda\mu),\zeta)=\langle\text{ad}^*_\lambda\mu,\zeta\rangle=-\langle\text{ad}^*_\zeta\mu,\lambda\rangle=0$, for every $\zeta\in\mathfrak{g}_\mu$, in particular if $\zeta\in\mathfrak{p}$. □

An inspection of the form of $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x}h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$ in (6.7) together with Theorem 4.1 leads to the following sharper result concerning the G_μ-stability of p_x.

Corollary 6.2 (Block-diagonalization and stability)**.** *In the hypothesis of Theorem 4.1, and assuming that the Arnold form in non-degenerate, if:*

(i) $\dim Q-\dim G+\dim G_x>0$
(ii) $\big(\mathbf{d}^2_xV_{\xi^\perp}+\text{corr}_{\,\xi^\perp}(x)\big)\big|_{\,\Sigma_{\text{int}}}$ *is positive definite*
(iii) *the Arnold form is positive definite,*

or

(i) $\dim Q-\dim G+\dim G_x=0$
(ii) *the Arnold form is definite (positive or negative),*

then the relative equilibrium is G_μ-stable.

Remark. In [19], Theorem 2.7, equivalent results to our Proposition 6.2 and Corollary 6.2 are obtained as a consequence of their reduced Energy-Momentum Method, for the particular case $G_x=\{e\}$ (regular relative equilibria).

7. Some remarks on the stability results

The residual symmetry sub-blocking.
In this subsection we will use the fact that the symplectic normal space V_s supports a linear representation of G_{p_x} in order to improve our block-diagonalization results. We start with the following lemma (see [17] for a proof):

Lemma 7.1. *Let $h\in H=G_x$, $\xi\in\mathfrak{r}$ and $v,w\in T_xQ$, then*

(i) $\text{Ad}^*_{h^{-1}}\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot v)(\xi)\right]=(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot(h\cdot v))(\text{Ad}_h\xi)$
(ii) $\ll C(h\cdot v)(\text{Ad}_h\xi),h\cdot w\gg_{\mathbf{S}}=\ll C(v)(\xi),w\gg_{\mathbf{S}}$.

As an immediate consequence of this and just by regarding their definitions (4.3), (3.15), (6.4), the spaces $\Sigma,\mathfrak{q}^\mu$ and Σ_{int} are G_{p_x}-invariant. We will use a tool from representation theory known as the *isotypic decomposition* of a linear space acted linearly upon a compact Lie group to take advantage of the residual symmetry group G_{p_x} in order to further block-diagonalize $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x}h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$. For this, we need the following definition, which is taken from [3].

Definition 7.1. *Let K be a compact Lie group acting linearly on a (real and finite dimensional) linear space N. The isotypic decomposition of N is the unique decomposition*

$$N=N_1\oplus\ldots\oplus N_r,$$

where each N_i is the direct sum of all K-isomorphic irreducible subspaces of N, and it is called an isotypic component *of N.*

The isotypic decomposition of a linear space satisfies the following remarkable property (see [3]): If B is a K-invariant bilinear form on N (that is, $B(g\cdot v_1,g\cdot v_2)=B(v_1,v_2)$ for every $g\in K$, $v_1,v_2\in N$) then $B\big|_{N_i\times N_j}=0$ for every pair of isotypic components of N with $N_i\neq N_j$. Therefore the expression of B block-diagonalizes

with respect to the isotypic decomposition of N. We will apply this property to the bilinear form given by $\mathbf{d}^2_x V_{\xi^\perp} + \operatorname{corr}_{\xi^\perp}(x)$.

Lemma 7.2. *Let p_x be a relative equilibrium of the simple mechanical system* (2.3) *with velocity ξ. Then the bilinear form $\mathbf{d}^2_x V_{\xi^\perp} + \operatorname{corr}_{\xi^\perp}(x)$ is G_{p_x}-invariant.*

Proof. We have to prove separately the invariance of each term. For $\mathbf{d}^2_x V_{\xi^\perp}$ the result follows if we prove that $V_{\xi^\perp}$ is G_{p_x}-invariant. Since V is G-invariant, and so G_{p_x}-invariant, we only need to prove that the function $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I}(\cdot)(\xi^\perp,\xi^\perp)$ is G_{p_x}-invariant. Recall that at a relative equilibrium, besides the characterization $G_{p_x} = G_\mu \cap G_x$, one also has $G_{p_x} = \{h \in G_x \,:\, \operatorname{Ad}_h \xi^\perp = \xi^\perp\}$, which follows trivially from the property

$$g \in G_{p_x} \Leftrightarrow g \cdot \mathbb{FL}(\xi^\perp_Q(x)) = \mathbb{FL}(\xi^\perp_Q(x)),$$

since $\xi^\perp \in \mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{r}$ and by definition our relative equilibrium can be written as $p_x = \mathbb{FL}(\xi_Q(x)) = \mathbb{FL}(\xi^\perp_Q(x))$. Recall also the invariance property of the locked inertia tensor (3.2). Then, for every $x' \in Q$ and $h \in G_{p_x}$, one has

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I}(h\cdot x')(\xi^\perp,\xi^\perp) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I}(x')(\operatorname{Ad}_{h^{-1}}\xi^\perp, \operatorname{Ad}_{h^{-1}}\xi^\perp) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I}(x')(\xi^\perp,\xi^\perp).$$

For the correction term, recall from Lemma 7.1, that if $h \in G_{p_x}$ and $\delta q \in T_xQ$, then

$$(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot(h\cdot\delta q))(\xi^\perp) = \operatorname{Ad}^*_{h^{-1}}\left((\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\delta q)(\xi^\perp)\right),$$

since $\operatorname{Ad}_h\xi^\perp = \xi^\perp$. Note also that $\hat{\mathbb{I}}_0 : \mathfrak{r} \to \mathfrak{r}^*$ is a G_x-equivariant isomorphism, that is $\hat{\mathbb{I}}_0 \circ \operatorname{Ad}_h = \operatorname{Ad}^*_{h^{-1}} \circ \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0$. Then, given $\delta q_1, \delta q_2 \in T_xQ$ and $h \in G_{p_x}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{corr}_{\xi^\perp}(x)(h\cdot\delta q_1, h\cdot\delta q_2) &= \langle (\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot(h\cdot\delta q_1))(\xi^\perp), \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\left((\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot(h\cdot\delta q_2))(\xi^\perp)\right)\rangle \\
&= \langle \operatorname{Ad}^*_{h^{-1}}\left((\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\delta q_1)(\xi^\perp)\right), \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\left(\operatorname{Ad}^*_{h^{-1}}\left((\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\delta q_2)(\xi^\perp)\right)\right)\rangle \\
&= \langle \operatorname{Ad}^*_{h^{-1}}\left((\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\delta q_1)(\xi^\perp)\right), \operatorname{Ad}_h\left(\hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\left((\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\delta q_2)(\xi^\perp)\right)\right)\rangle \\
&= \langle (\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\delta q_1)(\xi^\perp), \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}\left((\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\delta q_2)(\xi^\perp)\right)\rangle \\
&= \operatorname{corr}_{\xi^\perp}(x)(\delta q_1, \delta q_2)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Thus, in the hypothesis of Theorem 4.1 we can use the fact that Σ is a G_{p_x}-invariant subspace of T_xQ, and then testing the definiteness of $(\mathbf{d}^2_x V_{\xi^\perp} + \operatorname{corr}_{\xi^\perp}(x))\big|_\Sigma$ is equivalent to testing the definiteness of every restriction $(\mathbf{d}^2_x V_{\xi^\perp} + \operatorname{corr}_{\xi^\perp}(x))\big|_{\Sigma_i}$ where

$$\Sigma = \Sigma_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus \Sigma_r$$

is the isotypic decomposition of Σ. Analogously, if the Arnold form is not degenerate, to test the conditions for stability of Corollary 6.2 is equivalent to test definiteness of $\operatorname{Ar}_{\mathfrak{q}^\mu_i}$ and $(\mathbf{d}^2_x V_{\xi^\perp} + \operatorname{corr}_{\xi^\perp}(x))\big|_{\Sigma_{\text{int}\,i}}$ for each of the isotypic components of $\mathfrak{q}^\mu$ and Σ_{int}, respectively.

Nature of the stability results.

In Theorems 2.1 and 4.1 we have imposed the compactness of the momentum isotropy subgroup G_μ. However, this compactness condition can be weakened by assuming that μ is *split*, and this is how the original theorems are stated in [5] and [11]. A momentum value μ is called split if there exists a G_μ-invariant complement to $\mathfrak{g}_\mu$ in $\mathfrak{g}$. Obviously this is the case if G_μ is compact, since in this case one can define this complement to be the orthogonal complement to $\mathfrak{g}_\mu$ with respect to some

G_μ-invariant inner product on $\mathfrak{g}$. Likewise, if G itself is compact or Abelian, then every momentum value is automatically split.

In the most general situation, if the relative equilibrium under study has not a split momentum value, Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 6.2 are still applicable, but in that case one does not obtain conditions for G_μ-stability, only for the weaker notion of *leafwise stability*. A relative equilibrium is called leafwise stable if it is G_μ-stable for the restriction of the Hamiltonian flow to $\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)$. The reason for this nomenclature is that in the free case, a relative equilibrium z with momentum μ for the symmetric Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{P}, \omega, G, \mathbf{J}, h)$ is leafwise stable if the point $[z] \in \mathcal{P}/G$ in the orbit space is a Lyapunov stable equilibrium for the reduced Hamiltonian system on the symplectic leave $\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)/G_\mu \subset \mathcal{P}/G$, rather than being stable in the full Poisson quotient $\mathcal{P}/G$. The results of [5, 11, 15] guarantee that if μ is split, then leafwise stability of z implies Lyapunov stability of $[z]$ in $\mathcal{P}/G$, and, hence, so do Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 6.2. See [16] for a more detailed explanation of these concepts.

The reduced Energy-Momentum Method and Lagrangian Block-Diagonalization.

In [6] a method was constructed for testing the stability of relative equilibria of symmetric Lagrangian systems. In that work, the techniques of the reduced Energy-Momentum Method of [19] are translated to systems defined on the tangent bundle TQ of the configuration space and developed for general Lagrangian systems invariant under a possibly non free, tangent lifted action. We briefly explain the relationship of the results of [6] applied to simple mechanical systems with our work. See [6, 7] for more details on the Lagrangian Block-Diagonalization method.

Let $L \in C^G(TQ)$ be a function on the tangent bundle of Q invariant under the tangent lift of a proper action of the Lie group G on Q. This function is called a Lagrangian. There is a well-known procedure to obtain a bundle map $\mathbb{F}\mathrm{L} : TQ \to T^*Q$ constructed from L (no Riemannian structure is in principle available on Q). In the case $\mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}$ is a diffeomorphism, the Lagrangian is called hyper-regular, and one can pull-back the canonical symplectic form from T^*Q to TQ and define a Hamiltonian system on TQ (see [6] for details). Given an element $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$, the locked Lagrangian $L_\xi \in C^\infty(Q)$ is defined as

$$L_\xi(x) = L(\xi_Q(x)).$$

Also, the locked momentum map is defined as the map $I_\xi : Q \to \mathfrak{g}^*$ that satisfies

$$\langle I_\xi(x), \eta \rangle = \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0} L_{\xi + t\eta}(x)$$

for every $\eta \in \mathfrak{g}$. We will also need the definition of the space of admissible configuration variations at a point $x \in Q$, which is

$$\mathcal{D} = \{\delta q \in T_xQ \,:\, \mathbf{D}I_\xi \cdot \delta q \in \mathfrak{g}_x^\circ\}, \tag{7.1}$$

for a fixed element $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$. Finally, given $x \in Q$ and $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$ the linearized momentum map $I_x : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{g}^*$ is defined as

$$I_x(\eta) = \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0} I_{\xi + t\eta}(x)$$

for every $\xi, \eta \in \mathfrak{g}$. We will denote its generalized inverse by $\tilde{I}_x^{-1} : \operatorname{range} I_x \to \mathfrak{g}/\ker I_x$.

The Lagrangian Block-Diagonalization method gives sufficient conditions for formal stability of relative equilibria in Lagrangian systems. Under some assumptions, formal stability implies G_μ-stability. Here we shall not be concerned with those differences, in order to provide a comparison between the Lagrangian Block-Diagonalization and our singular reduced Energy-Momentum Method. Furthermore, one needs a technical condition relating I_ξ and I_x at a relative equilibrium in order to be able to apply the method (see (3.15) in [6]). However, for the particular case of Lagrangian systems defining simple mechanical systems this is automatically satisfied and thus it is not necessary for our comparison objective. So we assume that the Lagrangian Block Diagonalization method is applicable in order to simplify the exposition.

The next proposition collects the results of [6] concerning relative equilibria and their G_μ-stability. Let $\mathbf{g}$ be the symmetric bilinear form on T_xQ induced by the hyper-regular Lagrangian L and defined by

$$\mathbf{g}(v_x, w_x) = \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t\,=\,0} \frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s\,=\,0} L(tv_x + sw_x).$$

By the hyper-regularity hypothesis of L, $\mathbf{g}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is non-degenerate.

Proposition 7.1 (Lagrangian Block-Diagonalization, [6])**.** *Let $L \in C^G(TQ)$ be a hyper-regular Lagrangian invariant under the tangent lifted action of the Lie group G on Q. A point $v_x \in TQ$ is a relative equilibrium for the Lagrangian system defined on TQ by L if there is an element $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$ such that $v_x = \xi_Q(x)$ and x is a critical point of L_ξ. If the bilinear form*

$$\mathcal{B} = \left(-\mathbf{d}_x^2 L_\xi + \langle \mathbf{D}I_\xi \cdot (\cdot), \tilde{I_x}^{-1} (\mathbf{D}I_\xi \cdot (\cdot))\rangle\right)\Big|_{\mathcal{D}}$$

is positive (negative) semi-definite with kernel $\mathfrak{g}_\mu \cdot x$ and $\mathbf{g}_{|(\mathfrak{g}\cdot x)^\perp}$ is positive (negative) definite then the relative equilibrium is G_μ-stable.

We now study Lagrangians defining simple mechanical systems. It is a standard fact that if we are given a G-invariant Riemannian metric $\ll \cdot,\cdot \gg$ on Q and a G-invariant function $V \in C^G(Q)$, then the Lagrangian formulation of the associated simple mechanical system (2.3) is

$$L(v_x) = \frac{1}{2} \parallel v_x \parallel^2 - V(x). \tag{7.2}$$

For L of the form (7.2) it is straightforward to compute

$$\begin{array}{ll} L_\xi & = -V_\xi \\ I_\xi(x) & = \mathbb{I}(x)(\xi) \\ I_x & = \mathbb{I}(x) \\ \mathbf{g} & = \ll \cdot,\cdot \gg . \end{array}$$

Therefore, relative equilibria of the simple mechanical system (7.2) are defined by a velocity $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$ and a critical point $x \in Q$ of V_ξ, recovering the well-know result for critical points of the augmented Hamiltonian in simple mechanical systems.

To see that the stability conditions of Proposition 7.1 are then equivalent to those given in Theorem 4.1, one only needs to prove that at a relative equilibrium, the space $\Sigma \subset T_xQ$ of Definition 4.1 is indeed a complement to $\mathfrak{g}_\mu \cdot x$ in $\mathcal{D}$, but this follows from Lemma 6.1 and it has been already used in the proof of Proposition 6.1. This shows that our stability result, Theorem 4.1, is a Hamiltonian version of the Lagrangian Block-Diagonalization method applied to simple mechanical systems.

In the same way, one can see that the extra block-diagonalization construction carried out in subsection 3.3 of [6] is a consequence of the splitting of V_s in rigid and internal subspaces of Section 6 in this paper.

The normal form for the symplectic matrix.

Besides the convenient form for $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$ given in Proposition 6.2 which allowed us to refine Theorem 4.1 and re-express it as Corollary 6.2, it is important to note the particular expression for the symplectic matrix Ω of the symplectic normal space V_s identified with $\mathfrak{q}^\mu \oplus \Sigma_{\rm int} \oplus \mathbf{S}^*$. In the free case (see [9] and [19]), the explicit form for the symplectic matrix, together with the one for $\mathbf{d}^2_{p_x} h_{\xi^\perp}\big|_{V_s}$, allows the authors to obtain the linearization of the Hamiltonian vector field at a relative equilibrium. This is an important observation, since the study of this linearized vector field has applications in the spectral and linear stability (and instability) of the relative equilibrium under study, as well as for the identification of possible bifurcations from it.

It seems that despite the generalization to the Lagrangian side and non-free actions in [6] of the stability results provided by the reduced Energy-Momentum Method of [19], this feature has not been studied in detail for group actions with singularities and the expression for the symplectic matrix obtained in Proposition 6.2 for relative equilibria with non-discrete configuration isotropies cannot be found in the literature. Here we prove that our expression (6.6) coincides in the regular (free) case with the one obtained in [19], equations (2.83) and (2.85).

Indeed (and if we assume that the Arnold form is non-degenerate) given two elements $(\eta_i, (\lambda^{a_i}_Q(x) + a_i), \beta_i) \in \mathfrak{q}^\mu \oplus w_{\rm int} \oplus \mathbf{S}^* \simeq V_s$, $i = 1, 2$, we will write $\delta q_i = (\lambda^{a_i})_Q(x) + a_i$ and $\alpha(\delta q_i) = \hat{\mathbb{I}}_0^{-1}(\mathbf{J}(\mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}(\delta q_i))) = \lambda^{a_i}$. Then we have the following:

Proposition 7.2. *The expression for the symplectic matrix Ω of Proposition 6.2 is equivalent to*

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega((\eta_1, \delta q_1, \beta_1), (\eta_2, \delta q_2, \beta_2)) &= \langle \mu, -[\eta_1, \eta_2] - [\eta_1, \alpha(\delta q_2)] + [\eta_2, \alpha(\delta q_1)]\rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \beta_2, \delta q_1\rangle - \langle \beta_1, \delta q_2\rangle - \mathbf{d}\chi^{\xi^\perp}(x)(\delta q_1, \delta q_2),\end{aligned}$$

with $\chi^{\xi^\perp}$ defined in (4.1)*. This coincides in the regular case with equation (2.83) in* [19].

Proof. Recall from Proposition 6.2 that we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega((\eta_1, \delta q_1, \beta_1), (\eta_2, \delta q_2, \beta_2)) &= \langle \mu, -[\eta_1, \eta_2] - [\eta_1, \lambda^{a_2}] + [\eta_2, \lambda^{a_1}]\rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \beta_2, a_1\rangle - \langle \beta_1, a_2\rangle - \langle \mu, [\lambda^{a_1}, \lambda^{a_2}]\rangle \\ &\quad + \ll C(a_2)(\xi^\perp), a_1 \gg_{\mathbf{S}} - \ll C(a_1)(\xi^\perp), a_2 \gg_{\mathbf{S}}.\end{aligned}$$

Now note from the definition of α, that $[\eta_i, \alpha(\delta q_j)] = [\eta_i, \lambda^{a_j}]$. Also, since $\beta_i \in \mathbf{S}^* = (\mathfrak{g}\cdot x)^\circ$, $i = 1, 2$, one has that $\langle \beta_i, \delta q_j\rangle = \langle \beta_i, a_j\rangle$. Therefore, the proposition will be proved if we show that

$$\mathbf{d}\chi^{\xi^\perp}(x)(\delta q_1, \delta q_2) = \langle \mu, [\lambda^{a_1}, \lambda^{a_2}]\rangle - \ll C(a_2)(\xi^\perp), a_1 \gg_{\mathbf{S}} + \ll C(a_1)(\xi^\perp), a_2 \gg_{\mathbf{S}}.$$

To see this, we choose local extensions $X = (\lambda^{a_1})_Q + \overline{a}_1$ and $Y = (\lambda^{a_2})_Q + \overline{a}_2$ of δq_1 and δq_2 near x and then we use the formula for the exterior derivative

$$\mathbf{d}\chi^{\xi^\perp}(X, Y) = X\left(\chi^{\xi^\perp}(Y)\right) - Y\left(\chi^{\xi^\perp}(X)\right) - \chi^{\xi^\perp}([X, Y]).$$

We will need the following lemma, proved in [17], which shows additional properties of the family of local vector fields introduced in Section 3.

Lemma 7.3. *The local vector fields defined by* (3.11) *satisfy*

(i) $[\overline{v}_a, \overline{v}_b](x) = 0$ *for every* v_a, $v_b \in \mathbf{S}$
(ii) $[\lambda_Q, \overline{v}](x) = 0$ *for every* $\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}$, $v \in \mathbf{S}$
(iii) *There is a small enough open neighbourhood* $O \ni x$ *such that for every* $x' \in G \cdot x \cap O$, $v \in \mathbf{S}$ *and* $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$, $\ll \overline{v}(x'), \xi_Q(x') \gg = 0$.
(iv) *Let* $x' = \sigma([g,s])$ *with* σ *defined in* (3.10) *and* $\lambda \in \mathfrak{r}$, *then*

$$\lambda_Q(x') = \left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0} \sigma([(\exp_e t\lambda)g, s]).$$

Recall the definition $\chi^{\xi^\perp} = \mathbb{F}\mathrm{L}(\xi_Q^\perp)$ and let us compute separately the group orbit and slice contributions for $\mathbf{d}\chi^{\xi^\perp}(x)(X,Y)$ using the usual properties of the Levi-Civita connection.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{d}\chi^{\xi^\perp}(x)(a_1,a_2) &= \overline{a}_1\left(\ll \xi_Q^\perp, \overline{a}_2 \gg\right)(x) - \overline{a}_2\left(\ll \xi_Q^\perp, \overline{a}_1 \gg\right)(x) \\
&= \ll \nabla_{\overline{a}_1}\xi_Q^\perp(x), a_2 \gg + \ll \xi_Q^\perp(x), \nabla_{\overline{a}_1}\overline{a}_2(x) \gg \\
&\quad - \ll \nabla_{\overline{a}_2}\xi_Q^\perp(x), a_1 \gg - \ll \xi_Q^\perp(x), \nabla_{\overline{a}_2}\overline{a}_1(x) \gg \\
&= \ll C(a_1)(\xi^\perp), a_2 \gg_{\mathbf{S}} - \ll C(a_2)(\xi^\perp), a_1 \gg_{\mathbf{S}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the definition of C (3.12), together with item (v) in Theorem 3.1 and the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\ll \xi_Q^\perp(x), \nabla_{\overline{a}_1}\overline{a}_2(x) \gg - \ll \xi_Q^\perp(x), \nabla_{\overline{a}_2}\overline{a}_1(x) \gg \\
&\qquad = \ll \xi_Q^\perp(x), T(\overline{a}_1, \overline{a}_2)(x) \gg + \ll \xi_Q^\perp(x), [\overline{a}_1, \overline{a}_2](x)] \gg = 0
\end{aligned}$$

by item (i) of Lemma 7.3 as well as noting that the Levi-Civita connection has zero torsion ($T(X,Y) = \nabla_X Y - \nabla_Y X - [X,Y] = 0$, for every pair of vector fields X, Y). In the same way we can compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{d}\chi^{\xi^\perp}(x)((\lambda^{a_i})_Q(x), a_j) &= (\lambda^{a_i})_Q\left(\ll \xi_Q^\perp, \overline{a}_j \gg\right)(x) - \overline{a}_j\left(\ll \xi_Q^\perp, (\lambda^{a_i})_Q \gg\right)(x) \\
&\quad - \chi^{\xi^\perp}\left([(\lambda^{a_i})_Q, \overline{a}_j]\right)(x) = -(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot a_j)(\xi^\perp, \lambda^{a_i}),
\end{aligned}$$

since by (iii) and (ii) in Lemma 7.3 the first and last contributions vanish. Finally

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{d}\chi^{\xi^\perp}(x)((\lambda^{a_1})_Q(x), (\lambda^{a_2})_Q(x)) = \\
&\qquad (\lambda^{a_1})_Q\left(\ll \xi_Q^\perp, (\lambda^{a_2})_Q \gg\right)(x) - (\lambda^{a_2})_Q\left(\ll \xi_Q^\perp, (\lambda^{a_1})_Q \gg\right)(x) \\
&\qquad + \ll \xi_Q^\perp(x), ([\lambda^{a_1}, \lambda^{a_2}])_Q(x) \gg = (\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot(\lambda^{a_1})_Q(x))(\xi^\perp, \lambda^{a_2}) \\
&\qquad - (\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot(\lambda^{a_2})_Q(x))(\xi^\perp, \lambda^{a_1}) + \langle \mu, [\lambda^{a_1}, \lambda^{a_2}]\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting together all the contributions we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{d}\chi^{\xi^\perp}(x)(\delta q_1, \delta q_2) &= \langle \mu, [\lambda^{a_1}, \lambda^{a_2}]\rangle + \ll C(a_1)(\xi^\perp), a_2 \gg_{\mathbf{S}} - \ll C(a_2)(\xi^\perp), a_1 \gg_{\mathbf{S}} \\
&\quad + (\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\delta q_1)(\xi^\perp, \lambda^{a_2}) - (\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\delta q_2)(\xi^\perp, \lambda^{a_1}).
\end{aligned}$$

The last two terms of the above expression vanish since for $i = 1, 2$, $\lambda^{a_i} \in \mathfrak{q}^\mu \subset \mathfrak{t}$ and $(\lambda^{a_i}, a_i) \in w_{\mathrm{int}}$, and by its definition (6.2) $\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{t}}\left[(\mathbf{D}\mathbb{I}\cdot\delta q_1)(\xi^\perp)\right] = 0$. This finishes the proof. □

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Esmeralda Sousa-Dias, Matt Perlmutter and Tanya Schmah for many illuminating discussions over the past years which have helped me during the realization of this project. I would also like to thank CDS of the California Institute of Technology for their hospitality and facilities during a research visit in November 2004 when part of this project was carried out and in particular Jerrold Marsden for several useful suggestions and comments on this research during that period. This research was partially supported by the EU through funds for the European Research Training Network "MASIE", vide contract HPRN-CT-2000-00113. Finally, I would like to thank the referees for their comments on the manuscript.

References

[1] V.I Arnold [1966], Sur la géometrie differentielle des groupes de Lie de dimension infinie et ses applications à l'hydrodynamique des fluids parfaits, *Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble*, **16**, 319–361.
[2] J.J. Duistermaat and J.A.C. Kolk [2000], *Lie groups*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag.
[3] M. Golubitsky, I. Stewart and D.G. Schaeffer [1988], Singularities and groups in bifurcation theory. Vol. II. Applied Mathematical Sciences, 69. Springer-Verlag, New York.
[4] A. V. Karapetyan [1988], The Routh Theorem and its extensions, Colloq. Math. Soc. Janos Bolyai **53**, *Qualitative Theory of Differential Equations*, 271–290.
[5] E. Lerman and S.F. Singer [1998], Stability and persistence of relative equilibria at singular values of the moment map, *Nonlinearity* **11**, 1637–1649.
[6] D. Lewis [1992], Lagrangian Block-Diagonalization, *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations*, vol. **4**, No. **1**, 1–41.
[7] D. Lewis [1993], Bifurcations of liquid drops. *Nonlinearity* **6**, 491-522.
[8] D. Lewis, T.S. Ratiu, J.C. Simo and J.E. Marsden [1992], The heavy top: a geometric treatment, *Nonlinearity* **5**, 1–48.
[9] J.E. Marsden [1992], *Lectures on Mechanics*, Lecture Note Series **174**, LMS, Cambridge University Press.
[10] J. Montaldi [1997], Persistence and stability of relative equilibria, *Nonlinearity* **10**, 449–466.
[11] J.-P. Ortega and T.S. Ratiu [1999], Stability of Hamiltonian relative equilibria, *Nonlinearity* **12**, 693–720.
[12] R.S. Palais [1961], On the existence of slices for actions of non-compact Lie groups, *Ann. of Math.*, **73**, 265–323.
[13] G.P. Paternain [1999], *Geodesic Flows*, Progress in Mathematics **180**, Birkhauser.
[14] M. Pascal [1975], Sur la recherche des mouvements stationnaires dans les systemes ayant des variables cycliques, *Celestial Mechanics*, **12**, 337–358.
[15] G.W. Patrick [1992], Relative equilibria in Hamiltonian systems: the dynamic interpretation of nonlinear stability on a reduced phase space, *J. Geom. Phys.* **9**, no. 2, 111–119.
[16] G.W. Patrick, M. Roberts and C. Wulff [2002], Stability of Poisson Equilibria and Hamiltonian Relative Equilibria by Energy Methods, math.DS/0201239.
[17] M. Perlmutter, M Rodríguez-Olmos and E. Sousa-Dias [2004], The symplectic normal space of a cotangent-lifted action, *Diff. Geom. App.* to appear. Preprint math.SG/0501207.
[18] E.J. Routh [1877], *A Treatise on the Stability of a Given State of Motion*, MacMillan and Co, London.
[19] J.C. Simo, D. Lewis and J.E. Marsden [1991], Stability of relative equilibria. Part I: The reduced Energy-Momentum Method, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, **115**, 15–59.
[20] S. Smale [1970], Topology and Mechanics I, *Inventiones Math.*, **10**, 305–331.

Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Section de Mathématiques. CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland.